



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2007

No. 75

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 8, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

INDIA: A DEMOCRACY STRUGGLING FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I come to the House floor as a result of a town meeting I had in my congressional district in which I heard from the Harvest Christian Church. It goes to the point that the United States and India, as all of us know, are the world's two largest democracies. However, although the Indian National Government guarantees religious freedom, in many of the provinces, oppression and

persecution still exist. I want to bring that to my colleagues' attention this morning. Harvest Christian Church in my home district has worked closely with many church groups in India. And, as I mentioned, during my last town meeting, Pastor Crowe shared with me some of the disturbing things that are happening there.

On April 1, during Palm Sunday celebrations in Jabalpur, in the middle of their worship service, about 30 people from a Hindu extremist group—whose name literally means “religious army”—came with sticks and started beating everybody, including the evangelist and the men and women and children who were in the congregation that day. The pastor was badly beaten and suffers severe head injury. These people were admitted in the hospital where people from that group went and threatened them. They decided to leave the hospital and are currently staying at undisclosed locations. The attackers remain unpunished for these crimes. In fact, that day no one from the government condemned the attack or sympathized with the victims or the terrorized Christian community, not to speak of offering any relief to the family that were affected by this terrorist group. The police authorities, though reluctant to name the forces behind the attack, announced finally the arrest of five persons. All were from a radical Hindu background and lived in the slums the pastor used to visit regularly. Persecution such as this is not uncommon in India, and these sorts of attacks are not isolated incidents.

My colleagues, in another example, a mob of around 50 Hindu extremists surrounded a house church the night of April 22 and began shouting derogatory statements at all the worshipers in the church. Terrified believers in the church shut the doors, phoned the local police and asked for help. Two policemen arrived and took two pastors to the police station. En route, a few ac-

tivists began beating and insulting the pastors and four other believers who had accompanied them, as the police officers simply looked on. “At the station, the police shouted at the pastors, and the extremists who were present made accusations that the pastors were forcibly converting people and inciting the people to stop doing Hindu rituals and to remove pictures of Hindu deities from their houses,” George said. The tirade continued until 3 a.m., when the pastors were jailed, not being released on bail until April 25. The police inspector stated the pastors were charged with “promoting enmity” between different groups on grounds of religion and “deliberate and malicious acts, intended to outrage religious feelings or any class by insulting its religion or religious beliefs.”

While there is ongoing violence against Christians in India, the good news is that it is endemic and the number of incidents are not increasing. The BJP is a Hindu political party, which was in national power until 2004 when the secular constitution party then came to power. However, they still retain positions of power in some states, and it is there where the majority of attacks against Christians occur.

According to the State Department International Religious Freedom Report 2006, “The constitution provides for freedom of religion, and the government generally respects this right in practice. However, the government sometimes did not act swiftly enough to counter effectively societal attacks against religious minorities and attempts by some leaders of state and local governments to limit religious freedom. Despite government efforts to foster communal harmony, some extremists continued to view ineffective investigation and prosecution of attacks on religious minorities, particularly at the state and local level, as a signal that they could commit such violence with impunity.”

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4555

My colleagues, this is a situation that must not be tolerated. The frequency of these attacks and the lack of prosecution of extremists who perpetrate these crimes are in direct opposition to the most basic tenets of our democracy and surely the democracy in India. I urge the Indian Government to protect religious minorities and to take strong steps to enforce their constitutional laws regarding religious freedom in these oppressive provinces.

THE RISING PRICE OF GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. As I speak on the floor today, across America citizens are being gouged at the gas pump once again. Every year, as certain as Memorial Day is celebrated at the end of this month, the oil industry jacks up prices.

On the west coast in Oregon, I paid \$3.43 a gallon for regular in Springfield. My colleague, GREG WALDEN, paid \$3.99 on the east side of the mountains. The local paper accounts for this by saying "unexpected refinery maintenance." Hmm. Maybe they could schedule maintenance at a different time of year. No, that wouldn't be quite so profitable for the industry. In fact, the industry has been colluding for more than a decade to close down refinery capacity so they can have these wonderful price spikes and gouge American consumers.

There was an industry memo back then saying how the refinery sector wasn't particularly profitable, but through mergers the industry has managed to do away with more than 100 refineries. Now we have a refinery shortage. And if they just close one down to sweep the floors, the price of gas goes up 20 cents a gallon and the industry execs cry all the way to the bank and to their bonuses. This has to stop. We have to get back in charge of this industry. We've got to break up these huge conglomerates. Start with a moratorium on further mergers. Break 'em up. Impose a windfall profits tax. Unless they invest in more refinery capacity, unless they invest in new fuels or energy efficiency, confiscate the money from them through a windfall profits tax which they have taken from the American consumers through price-gouging and reinvest it to bring down prices and make this country more energy-efficient in the future. We need both a short-term and a long-term strategy to deal with this industry.

We have to take on the OPEC cartel. Now, this President is all about free trade. All about free trade. He wants more free trade agreements. Seven of the members of OPEC are in the World Trade Organization, highly touted by this President as a rules-based trade organization to promote free trade. They are conspiring and colluding among themselves and with Big Oil to

jack up the price of oil. That's illegal under the WTO. Why won't President Bush file a complaint against OPEC? Perhaps because he's a little too tight with the Saudis, the royal family that runs that country and others. And they obviously, as well as industry execs, are profiting immensely from this situation.

We need to, as I said earlier, ban further mergers. My bill would establish a commission to study market power and suggest remedies to that. To me the simplest remedy is antitrust and to break up some of these giant conglomerates and again begin to bring a little bit of competition back to this industry.

The windfall profits tax I mentioned earlier, impose a windfall profits tax on these folks and take that money and reinvest it in energy efficiency and new fuels and research unless they will spend the money on energy efficiency, new fuels, and refinery capacity which is needed in this country.

If we don't take action, it isn't going to happen. ExxonMobil is making \$4.6 million per hour, \$109 million per day, \$3.2 billion a month and \$40 billion last year. One corporation. Last quarter they set yet another record. And you can bet with the price-gouging going on today, they're going to set yet another record. Every quarter is a new record. But the President talks about free market forces. These aren't free market forces. These people are conspiring to gouge the American consumers and drive up prices at the pump. We need real price relief soon. This Congress must act and the President must stop stonewalling and protecting his friends both domestically and internationally who are involved in the oil cartel.

CHINA AND THE 2008 OLYMPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentlelady.

I want Members to see an editorial that was in the Wall Street Journal by Ronan Farrow and Mia Farrow entitled "The Genocide Olympics."

It deals with the issue that there was a full page ad today in The Washington Post with regard to the genocide that is taking place in Sudan, and the one country that has the opportunity to really make a difference to stop the genocide in Sudan is the country of China.

Mia Farrow says in this editorial, "One World, One Dream is China's slogan for the 2008 Olympics. But there is one nightmare that China shouldn't be allowed to sweep under the rug. That nightmare is Darfur, where more than 400,000 people have been killed and more than 2½ million driven from flaming villages by the Chinese-backed government of Sudan."

I have seen those villages and the burning of the villages and we know

that the genocide could be stopped by China.

Mia Farrow goes on to say, "That so many corporate sponsors want the world to look away from that atrocity during the games is bad enough. But equally disappointing is the decision of artists like director Steven Spielberg, who quietly visited China this month as he prepares to help stage the Olympic ceremonies, to sanitize Beijing's image." Steven Spielberg, who produced Schindler's List, is now going to try to turn the 2008 Olympics in China to look like a wonderful, wonderful thing.

China is involved in Sudan where they have Antonov bombers bombing the people, helicopters coming in and killing the people, and the Janjaweed who come in and do all sorts of bad things—kill, rape and maim. And China has used its veto power, Mia Farrow says, on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter. Beijing, she says, is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

Now, there are some people saying that maybe—maybe—the 2008 Olympics ought to be boycotted. Now, how will you feel, watching or going to the 2008 Olympics and knowing that the country that is doing that could stop the genocide in Darfur?

And so I would urge that if China does not deal with the issue, then the sponsors, but also the people from the West, certainly ought not encourage China to say that we don't care, therefore, we're going to go to your Olympics when Mia Farrow calls it "the Genocide Olympics."

And then she says some other very tough things about Spielberg. Does he really want to be this? I mean, the Chinese are in essence doing what the Nazis did in the Olympics in the thirties, cleaning the streets and changing things.

China has the ability to stop the genocide that is taking place in Sudan, and I think everyone should do everything they can. This administration should do more and everyone in the Congress should do more, that if China doesn't use its leverage in the U.N. and allow the Security Council to pass a resolution allowing the end to come out with regard to U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur, then I believe that Mia Farrow and those who are concerned and are considering boycotting the Olympics will be right. This is a test for China.

Now, the Chinese Embassy is working this Hill aggressively. The Chinese Embassy will be working the administration. The Chinese Embassy will be working powerful governments around the world. But as long as the genocide continues in Darfur where 400,000 people have died, 2.1 million are living in refugee camps, knowing that China has the ability to stop what it mentions on

page A-18 in the Washington Post today in this editorial to stop this, then if China is not prepared to use their leverage to stop the genocide, then quite frankly I think Mia Farrow's title of calling this "the Genocide Olympics" will be true and no one should attend those Olympics.

THE "GENOCIDE OLYMPICS"

(By Ronan Farrow and Mia Farrow)

"One World, One Dream" is China's slogan for its 2008 Olympics. But there is one nightmare that China shouldn't be allowed to sweep under the rug. That nightmare is Darfur, where more than 400,000 people have been killed and more than two-and-a-half million driven from flaming villages by the Chinese-backed government of Sudan.

That so many corporate sponsors want the world to look away from that atrocity during the games is bad enough. But equally disappointing is the decision of artists like director Steven Spielberg—who quietly visited China this month as he prepares to help stage the Olympic ceremonies—to sanitize Beijing's image. Is Mr. Spielberg, who in 1994 founded the Shoah Foundation to record the testimony of survivors of the holocaust, aware that China is bankrolling Darfur's genocide?

China is pouring billions of dollars into Sudan. Beijing purchases an overwhelming majority of Sudan's annual oil exports and state-owned China National Petroleum Corp.—an official partner of the upcoming Olympic Games—owns the largest shares in each of Sudan's two major oil consortia. The Sudanese government uses as much as 80% of proceeds from those sales to fund its brutal Janjaweed proxy militia and purchase their instruments of destruction: bombers, assault helicopters, armored vehicles and small arms, most of them of Chinese manufacture. Airstrips constructed and operated by the Chinese have been used to launch bombing campaigns on villages. And China has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter.

As one of the few players whose support is indispensable to Sudan, China has the power to, at the very least, insist that Khartoum accept a robust international peacekeeping force to protect defenseless civilians in Darfur. Beijing is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

But there is now one thing that China may hold more dear than their unfettered access to Sudanese oil: their successful staging of the 2008 Summer Olympics. That desire may provide a lone point of leverage with a country that has otherwise been impervious to all criticism.

Whether that opportunity goes unexploited lies in the hands of the high-profile supporters of these Olympic Games. Corporate sponsors like Johnson & Johnson, Coca-Cola, General Electric and McDonalds, and key collaborators like Mr. Spielberg, should be put on notice. For there is another slogan afoot, one that is fast becoming viral amongst advocacy groups; rather than "One World, One Dream," people are beginning to speak of the coming "Genocide Olympics."

Does Mr. Spielberg really want to go down in history as the Leni Riefenstahl of the Beijing Games? Do the various television sponsors around the world want to share in that shame? Because they will. Unless, of course, all of them add their singularly well-positioned voices to the growing calls for Chinese action to end the slaughter in Darfur.

Imagine if such calls were to succeed in pushing the Chinese government to use its

leverage over Sudan to protect civilians in Darfur. The 2008 Beijing Olympics really could become an occasion for pride and celebration, a truly international honoring of the authentic spirit of "one world" and "one dream."

RESPONSIBILITY TO IRAQI REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am privileged to take the floor after my colleague from Virginia and I am in agreement with the sentiment that he has expressed. However, I would like to speak for a moment about the second greatest refugee crisis in the world after Darfur.

Four years after the fall of Baghdad, many of the worst fears expressed at the beginning of that war have come true, as Iraq and its neighbors are in the midst of a humanitarian crisis rivaled only by the ongoing genocide in Darfur, referenced by my good friend from Virginia. Iraq has the fastest growing refugee population in the world. The United States has a responsibility to try to protect the innocent victims of massive violence wherever it can. However, having made the decision to begin a war of choice in Iraq, we have a particular responsibility to those who are suffering as a result of America's actions. Whatever one believes about the wisdom of the war or the future of the United States' engagement in Iraq, we have a responsibility to those innocent Iraqis who have been driven from their homes or fear for their lives every day.

The numbers are sobering. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees estimates 4 million Iraqis have been made refugees, 2 million of which have left for adjacent countries like Syria and Jordan. Every month, another 50,000 to 70,000 Iraqis continue to be displaced from their homes, and these figures likely underestimate the magnitude of the problem. These are the front lines of a regional humanitarian crisis, one that could easily destabilize these front line countries that neighbor Iraq and turn a humanitarian crisis into a security disaster.

For one group in particular, however, our moral responsibility is unquestionable—Iraqis who are at risk because they helped the United States. Having collaborated with the United States military, the United Nations or even with a nongovernmental organization can literally mean a death sentence at the hands of any of the many sides in this civil war. Tens of thousands of Iraqis, who worked as translators, drivers, even construction workers, live every day in fear of being targeted. However, the United States is only allowing 50 Iraqi translators to start their lives over in the United States.

Over the next few months, that may be raised to 500, a number that is still dwarfed by the need.

I became acutely aware of this problem working with a local high school in Portland who were partnering with members of the Oregon National Guard who had served in Iraq who were trying to bring their translator to the United States to save her life but kept running into bureaucratic hurdles. Since then, I've heard the same story over and over again.

We should keep faith with those who have served alongside our brave men and women in uniform. This is a basic moral responsibility and a simple issue of fairness. Yet in March, the United States admitted only 11 Iraqi refugees. Since the war began, we have admitted only 700—remember, out of 4 million displaced.

I am introducing legislation this week, the Responsibility to Iraqi Refugees Act, to address this ongoing humanitarian crisis to use all of the tools at our disposal, admitting refugees, providing assistance to the region, and using diplomacy to ensure their well-being. It creates a program to admit to the United States Iraqis who are at risk because they helped coalition or reconstruction efforts. It establishes a special coordinator for Iraqi refugees and internally displaced people and requires the United States to develop plans to ensure the well-being and safety of these Iraqi refugees. Most important, it increases the number of persecuted Iraqis who can be admitted to the United States as refugees. And, finally, it would authorize additional funding for assistance to those refugees, their resettlement and fixing the bureaucratic process that often hampers even the most well-intended efforts.

I urge every Member of the House to cosponsor this broad, ambitious and comprehensive response to the Iraqi refugee crisis before it is too late, too late for the people whose only crime was working with Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, Your heavens are filled with the wide and brilliant blue, a common

roof over all the earth, so it seems from the viewpoint of Capitol Hill. Spring breezes contain a purity this side of tragic tornados. Yet the news, like unseen pollen, carries life and discomfort for some in the same moment.

Why, O Lord, is the world such a mixture of good and evil? 24/7 communication wires the mind with stories of victory and devastation so quickly that human perception must choose its ground.

Help national government, Lord, admit limitations even before it discerns a problem or conducts another hearing. Free choice and determined truth must find a balance if pluralistic democracy is to stand.

So we humbly lay before You, Lord, God of heaven and earth, the freshness of a new day, and seek Your blessing upon those who cultivate a culture and plan a future for us both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BOUSTANY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RISE TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Ford Motor Company has announced the closing of a casting plant in Cleveland where they're going to be outsourcing their engine casting business, and idling production at another engine plant for a year.

We are seeing all these blue collar jobs outsourced in this country, and many white collar jobs as well. We're losing millions of manufacturing jobs. And it's not enough to just let this slide by without trying to challenge it.

We have to have a new manufacturing policy in America where the maintenance of steel, automotive and aerospace is considered to be vital to our national economic security.

We have to have a new not-for-profit health care system which covers all workers, so American businesses are not collapsed by the high cost of health insurance.

And we have to have a new trade policy, which means the end of NAFTA

and the WTO, and the beginning of trade based on workers rights, human rights and environmental quality principles.

Our community in Cleveland is going to rally behind our auto workers. We're going to do everything we can to see if it's possible to save those plants and to make it possible to find ways of using those plants. But all across this country, we have to rise to meet this challenge.

AL QAEDA'S PRESENCE IN IRAQ

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle is going to great lengths to make the case for retreat in Iraq. It seems they'll even ignore the facts if it helps their case.

For some time now, the other side has been saying that the war in Iraq is not part of the war on terror but a distraction from it.

Mr. Speaker, the latest video released by al Qaeda's number two operative clears that up. In this latest rant calling for our destruction, Ayman al Zawahiri calls the violence in Iraq a jihad. He optimistically states that the situation in Iraq "is moving from the stage of defeat of the crusader invaders to the stage of consolidating a Mujahid Islamic Emirate."

He goes on to proclaim that this victory for the terrorists will "raise the banner of Jihad."

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we are fighting al Qaeda terrorists in Iraq. And if we are unwilling to defeat them there, where exactly will we do so?

Mr. Speaker, when we are honest about who we are fighting in Iraq, the implication becomes clear: We must win in Iraq.

BACK AT SQUARE ONE

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush vetoed the Iraqi supplemental. I am disappointed that the President did not attempt to work with us here in Congress prior to his veto. We are now back at square one.

The American people want a new direction for Iraq. Our current strategy is not working, with more sectarian violence spreading throughout Iraq each and every day. If a solution will be reached in this conflict, the Iraqi government must take more responsibility for their future.

The U.S. commitment to end the war in Iraq cannot be open-ended. We must put pressure on the Iraqi government to make political, economical and diplomatic reforms. So far these reforms have not been made, and little progress has been shown by the Iraqi government.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the Iraqi war and we talk about terrorism, Iraq did not have terrorists there until we went in, did not do our job in the first several months, and that is why we have terrorism in Iraq today. We must defeat it. We must bring our boys home.

Let the Iraqi government now take care of their own problems.

SUPPORT H. CON. RES. 133

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, many Americans lack protection from catastrophic long-term care expenses related to chronic illnesses and disabilities. Worse yet, many of these families assume Medicare will pay for long-term care services, while it generally does not.

Despite funding from Congress for long-term care education activities, the Department of Health and Human Services has done little to inform families and caregivers of this confusion.

HHS has neglected to clarify these Medicare misperceptions with at least 90 percent of households contacted through its long-term care awareness direct mail campaign. HHS has a duty to use other communication methods to inform families.

I recently introduced a bipartisan resolution with Representative STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN to encourage Secretary Leavitt to be more proactive on this issue, so Americans can have greater independence, choice and control over the services they need in the setting they prefer.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 133.

DEMOCRATS' BUDGET PRIORITIZES NEEDS OF OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats took control of Congress this year, we pledged that the voices of children would become a top priority for a change. This month Democrats will complete a final budget that meets our commitment to our children and abides by tough pay-as-you-go rules we reinstituted in January.

This new Congress has a responsibility to clean up the fiscal mess that we inherited. Deficits matter. Over the last 6 years, the choice to live beyond our means has come at a great expense to our children who will be forced to pay off that debt. The Democratic budget says, enough with deficit spending. Unlike the President's budget, ours will be balanced within the next 5 years.

First, we increase funding for our children's health care by \$50 billion

over the next 5 years, which will allow States to ensure millions of children who are now uninsured. And then we will provide \$7.9 billion over the President's budget for education funding so we can really mean it when we say, No child left behind.

FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT OF 2007

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, enshrined in the first amendment of the Constitution are these words: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Nevertheless, in the last two decades, we have seen a troubling increase in the number of occasions where reporters have faced threats of subpoena, subpoenas and even jail time for refusing to reveal confidential sources.

Mr. Speaker, compelling reporters to testify and compelling them to reveal the identity of their confidential sources is a detriment to the public interest. And last week, my colleague, Congressman RICK BOUCHER of Virginia, along with a distinguished bipartisan group of original cosponsors, introduced the Free Flow of Information Act, which would protect a reporter's right to keep confidential sources confidential.

As a conservative who believes in limited government, I believe the only check on government power in real time is a free and independent press.

I urge all of my colleagues to give due consideration to this bipartisan legislation. Let us put a stitch in this tear in the first amendment freedom of the press. I urge cosponsorship of the Free Flow of Information Act.

ACCOUNTABILITY HAS RETURNED

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, accountability has returned to Washington with a new Congress that takes its oversight responsibilities very seriously.

In the past 4 months, Congress has conducted over 180 oversight hearings on issues very important to the American people. These are not just hearings; they're hearings that have led to action.

Walter Reed: Since we concluded our hearing, we determined on a bipartisan basis after the information came out that more money was needed. We put \$1.7 billion to make certain that we would take care of our wounded warriors.

Congress now continues to oversee the ever-changing U.S. attorney scandal. The American people absolutely must have confidence that the U.S. Attorney's Office is about enforcing the

law, not making it up as they go along or pursuing outcomes for partisan political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have real accountability without congressional oversight, and this is one of the ways the new Democratic Congress is changing the way that we do business here in Washington.

H.R. 1595, GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

(Mr. FORTUÑO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, three former Republican Governors from Guam; in addition to the current Governor, Felix Camacho; two former Democratic Guam Governors; one former Republican Guam Delegate; two former Guam Delegates; and the current Delegate from Guam, MADELEINE BORDALLO, have all fought for fair treatment for the patriotic people of Guam who endured nearly 3 years of brutal enemy occupation during World War II.

In addition, the 109th Republican-controlled Congress, the Resources Committee, chaired by Congressman Richard Pombo; the Judiciary Committee, chaired by Mr. SENSENBRENNER, both acted in a bipartisan effort to favorably pass legislation to give parity to Guam.

Acknowledging the patriotism of the people of Guam, who were American nationals, throughout Guam's occupation has been a bipartisan effort for decades.

This issue is about patriotism; certainly not about partisanship. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1595 when it comes up for a vote today.

NATIONAL TEACHER'S DAY

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Today is National Teacher's Day, a day which is very important to me and my family.

This year's theme for National Teacher's Day is "Great Teachers Make Great Public Schools." And I know that's true.

I had wonderful teachers in the Jefferson County public schools, and those teachers had a tremendous impact on my life.

Our three daughters are products of Jefferson County public schools, and my sister is a public school teacher.

Few other professionals touch as many people as teachers do. Teachers are our role models, our confidants, our taskmasters and our moral compass.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to invest in our schools, reduce class sizes and ensure that our teachers have the tools and resources they need to give our children the high quality education necessary to succeed in an increasingly competitive global economy.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF BILLINGS, MONTANA

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing legislation to recognize the 125th anniversary of the City of Billings, Montana. First discovered by Lewis and Clark on the famous expedition, Billings is now the most populous city in the Northern Rocky Mountain Region of the United States.

I know for many U.S. cities, 125 years isn't very long. However, for Billings, these years have created a rich history that stretches beyond its age.

Historically, Billings has been the gateway to the Pacific northwest. Even its name, which originated with the former president of the Northern Pacific Railroad, Frederic Billings, is a description of the city's historical role as an important railway link to the northwest.

Billings has also been home to many notable people. For instance, in 1907, famous cowboy, author and illustrator, Will James came to Billings, where he lived and worked for years. Finally, the city is home to the oldest higher education institution in the State of Montana, Rocky Mountain College.

Today the city serves as an example of an all-American city through both its flourishing economy and its continued growth. I congratulate the city of Billings, Montana, and its years of rich history.

KEEPING OUR CONTRACT WITH OUR NATION'S VETERANS

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FILNER. When the Democrats became the majority of this Congress earlier this year, we promised to keep our contract with our Nation's veterans, to keep our contract.

So how have we done during the first four months as Democrats? Wherever we stand on the war, wherever we stand on the war, we are committed to make sure that every young man and woman who returns from that war gets all the care, the love, the attention, the honor, respect and dignity that this Nation can bestow.

And in the first three budget bills that went by this House, in the last 3 months, we were able to add over last year's total over \$13 billion for veterans health care; \$13 billion, that's almost a 30 percent increase over last year. The biggest in the history of the Veterans' Administration.

And we're going to use that money to make sure that the terrible brain-injured veterans that come back, those who have physical scars or mental scars (PTSD, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder) will get all the care that an advanced Nation can give.

As a nation, we are not doing our job now, but we Democrats are committed to making sure the job is done.

ANOTHER DAY BUT NOT ANOTHER DOLLAR

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, another day, but yet not other dollar has been sent by Congress to supply our warriors in Iraq with the equipment and resources they need.

The troops will soon be out of money to carry on the war in Iraq. Congress needs to get needed funds to our military.

Our troops are the best ever assembled for warfare. They are all volunteers. They will do their duty in spite of congressional inaction for money.

Our troops are relentless. They adhere to the words of Winston Churchill in 1941. "There shall be no halting or half measures. We cannot for a minute afford to relax. On the contrary, we must drive ourselves forward with unrelenting zeal."

So Congress must appropriate money to make that military mission successful. And what is that mission?

In part, it is what President John F. Kennedy said years ago: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty."

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1215

GUAM WAR CLAIMS REVIEW COMMISSION

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam endured a brutal occupation of public executions, beheadings, rape, beatings, forced labor, forced march, and internment in concentration camps during the occupation of Guam in World War II.

So why are we just now dealing with war claims? Because a Federal Guam War Claims Review Commission appointed by Secretary Norton reaffirmed what the Hopkins Commission found in 1947, that the Guam war claims issue has not been addressed. And here is this report, over 1,000 pages.

Let me say this in a clear way. The people who were occupied were ignored by their own government. All war claims were settled by Congress for the American people. The commission found this has never been rectified for Guam. The review commission stated very clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is our moral obligation.

So I urge today my colleagues to pass H.R. 1595 to fulfill this moral obligation to American citizens.

ASIAN CARP

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a broad, bipartisan coalition that is working to implement a strategy for the restoration, protection, and sustainable use of the Great Lakes.

In addition to supporting a comprehensive bill that would help stop sewage contamination, prevent invasive species introductions, and restore wetlands in the Great Lakes, I am also supporting H.R. 553, the Great Lakes Asian Carp Barrier Act.

Asian carp consume large amounts of food and compete with native fish for habitat throughout the Great Lakes region. Our Great Lakes would suffer irreparable harm if the Asian carp enters Lake Michigan.

With other aquatic invasive species already wreaking havoc on our waters, the threat posed by Asian carp is not one Michiganders can afford to overlook.

We must act now and construct barriers to protect native fish and wildlife from these large, nonnative predatory fish. It is time for Congress to invest in restoring the Great Lakes, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill vital to maintaining these aquatic treasures essential to both Michigan and the entire Nation.

H.R. 1595, GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise in recognition of the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

Twenty-two thousand American nationals were captured during World War II by the Japanese Imperial Forces. All 22,000 were detained on U.S. territory, the island of Guam. For nearly 31 months, these U.S. citizens were civilian prisoners of war. Many were executed and many atrocities were committed against them that included rape, physical torture, and other such efforts, all committed because of their loyalty to the United States. They refused to become a part of Imperial Japan. They would not bow to the occupiers.

Two Federal commissions have now recommended to Congress that we have the moral obligation to make our fellow Americans whole from the suffering they endured because of their loyalty and patriotism to our country.

I will vote in favor of H.R. 1595, the Guam World War II Loyalty Act carried by our colleague, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. This is an important measure. We must never forget.

HENRY HYDE

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago the Supreme Court upheld the ban on the abomination of partial-birth abortion.

I come this morning to say thank you to one of our former Members, the Honorable Chairman Henry Hyde, who served in this body for almost 30 years. Chairman Hyde stood up for the sanctity of life at every step of the way, every day that he served in this great body, and I hope he is enjoying his retirement in the great State of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, Henry once said, "This is not a debate about religious doctrine or even about public policy options. It is a debate about our understanding of human dignity, what it means to be a member of the human family even though tiny, powerless, and unwanted."

And I hope my colleagues will all reflect on these words.

Chairman Hyde, we thank you from the bottom of our heart. God bless you for your service to this great body.

NEW DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS PRODUCING POSITIVE RESULTS FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 4 months since Democrats took control of Congress, and already we see a dramatic change in how business is done on Capitol Hill.

To begin with, we restored the 5-day workweek so that actually we are addressing the people's business. Longer workweeks have led to more bills and resolutions being passed. In 2005 the previous Congress had only 72 bills up to this point. This year alone we have already passed 165. That is almost 100 bills more in this short 4-month period of time.

We have also approved a budget for the upcoming fiscal year that significantly increases funding for veterans' health care, children's health care and education. And we do it all without raising taxes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we've only been in charge now for 4 months, but we are already producing positive results for the American people.

BORDER AGENTS NO-CONFIDENCE VOTE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, did you know that the Nation's border agents have no confidence in their top chief? These men and women are on the front lines of illegal immigration. They want, need, and deserve strong leadership.

Recently, the National Border Patrol Council, the union representing the country's 11,000 nonsupervisory border agents, announced it had cast a unanimous no-confidence vote in U.S. Border

Patrol Chief David Aguilar. The vote comes as two border agents sit in jail for doing their jobs, combating illegal immigration.

If you are as outraged as I am about the unjust persecution of law enforcement agents, go to pardontheagents.com and sign an on-line petition urging President Bush to pardon Agents Ramos and Compean.

TBI BILL, H.R. 2179

(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2179, the Traumatic Brain Injury Centers Act.

I introduced this bill because traumatic brain injury, or TBI, has become the signature injury of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and it needs our Nation's full attention.

While new forms of military technology are routinely saving soldiers' lives from deadly explosive attacks, these survivors often return home suffering from TBI. Veterans suffering from TBI may have trouble relearning simple skills or might be left permanently unable to perform daily functions.

H.R. 2179 would help veterans and their families cope with TBI by creating five traumatic brain injury centers. These centers would conduct TBI research, develop improved models for TBI care, and provide education and training on TBI for VA staff. While the VA has built an impressive medical system that includes polytrauma centers, H.R. 2179 would ensure that the VA system includes centers solely focussed on TBI. These centers will be the focal point for research and education dealing with this injury.

As American servicemembers return home, many of them suffering from TBI, we owe them nothing less than the highest quality care this Nation can provide.

CORRUPTION IS ALIVE AND WELL IN CONGRESS

(Mr. SHAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues talk about the great activity in the House.

We had great activity in the House before. You didn't have a do-nothing Congress last year. You had a do-nothing Senate. And you're going to have a do-nothing Senate again this year. You're going to stack up all your bills and you're going to be waiting just like we did.

The other outrage that is happening is there is a bill, H.R. 1294, that is going to recognize six Indian tribes, bypass the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Corruption is alive and well in this place again because that's what we did a few years ago. We stopped it. There is

a process that should be followed. Go before the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

How do we know what's a tribe? How do we know if there's economic, social, and political continuity of these tribes precolonial time?

The Democrats are bringing back a corrupt practice. I urge you to pay attention to this.

H.R. 1595, GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

Two Federal commissions, one in 1947 and the other in 2004, recommended to the Congress that the people of Guam have not been made whole despite efforts to rehabilitate their lives and livelihoods that were destroyed during Guam's occupation by Japanese Imperial Forces during World War II.

Two Federal commissions have spoken about the atrocities of war they lived through: beheadings by public executions, rapes and torture. Two Federal commissions have underscored that the patriotism of the people of Guam during their occupation was unquestionable. Two Federal commissions recommended we make additional reparations to give them justice and parity.

It is past time that Congress heeds the recommendations of both Federal commissions to recognize their loyalty and patriotism. I urge my colleagues today to vote in favor of H.R. 1595, the Guam World War II Loyalty Act.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS MUST REALIZE THAT A CHANGE OF COURSE IS NEEDED IN IRAQ

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bush vetoed a plan to fund our troops and to change the direction in Iraq. Following his veto, the House voted for the fourth time in 3 months for a new direction in Iraq and rejected the President's open-ended commitment.

Unfortunately, House Republicans have refused to join us in our attempts to change the course of the war. Republican Leader BOEHNER said over the weekend that he wants a clean bill. What he is really saying is that he wants us to rubber-stamp the President's war proposal. That's what Republican Congresses have been doing for 4 years, and it hasn't helped our military and it hasn't made America safer.

When are House Republicans going to realize that the American people overwhelmingly support benchmarks and a real plan to change direction in Iraq? One encouraging sign was when Leader

BOEHNER said this weekend that he would be willing to look at a plan B in September. Does that mean that House Republicans will finally begin to join us in changing the course of the war in Iraq? We'll have to wait and see.

□ 1230

IN SUPPORT OF GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's headline in Guam reads, "Island in state of mourning." This is because Guam has lost its 10th son to the war in Iraq. The headline could read the same after yesterday's call for a recorded vote by the Republican leadership on H.R. 1595, the Guam World War II Loyalty Act, a bipartisan bill giving parity to Guam after 63 years of inequity and injustice.

The question we must ask ourselves before this vote today is, will we ignore history? Will we be deaf to the testimonials of Guam's liberators, our U.S. servicemen, who spoke about Guam's patriotism in the face of enemy occupation? Will we vote against inequity for people who aided our military to take Guam back from the enemy, who greeted our military with tattered rags made into American flags?

A vote against H.R. 1595 is one against patriotic Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the Guam World War II Loyalty Act.

IN SUPPORT OF GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

When the Japanese invaded Guam during World War II, six U.S. servicemen remained on the island. Rather than surrender, these six men fled into the jungle. The Japanese soon learned of their presence and demanded that they turn themselves in. They threatened execution of anyone found helping the American soldiers.

Despite these threats, the American soldiers refused to surrender and the people of Guam continued to help them avoid capture. They faced long odds with the Japanese military conducting intense searches of the island, but one soldier, George Tweed, survived. Tweed was later awarded the Legion of Merit medal for his efforts. One of his protectors, Antonio Cruz Artero, was awarded the Medal of Freedom. Countless others who aided Tweed received nothing but the satisfaction of knowing they helped save the life of a man who symbolized hope for Americans to return and liberate Guam.

Today's vote will recognize the patriotism of the people of Guam, who risked their lives to save a U.S. serviceman.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1595.

DEMOCRATS TO COMPLETE BUDGET PROCESS THAT CONTINUES TO TAKE NATION IN NEW DIRECTION

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this month the Democratic Congress will approve a final budget plan that, unlike the President's budget, will actually be balanced over the next 5 years, and we do it without raising taxes. Now the President likes to claim that his budget proposal achieves balance by 2012 and does not increase taxes, but that's simply not true. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget will still be running a \$9 billion deficit 5 years from now.

The President's broken promises don't stop there. His budget would also cost middle-class families \$247 billion in tax increases over the next 5 years under the alternative minimum tax, and \$500 billion in taxes on employer-provided health insurance.

Fortunately, Democrats rejected the President's budget. Instead, we restore fiscal integrity to our Nation, protect middle-income families from tax increases and actually reach balance by the year 2012. The American people asked us to take this Nation in a new direction, and our budget answers their call.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, give peace a chance.

SENDING IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL BILL TO PRESIDENT'S DESK—BUSH WAS WRONG TO VETO

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, President Bush declared that major combat operations in Iraq were over. To that point, we had lost 139 soldiers. Over the last 4 years, due to the administration's incompetence and lack of planning, thousands more U.S. troops have been killed and wounded, hundreds of billions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer money has been spent, and now Iraq is consumed by a civil war that the President is asking our troops to referee.

It was way too soon for the President to declare mission accomplished, but 4 years later, the President seems content to tell our soldiers that their mission is not going to be accomplished any time soon.

By vetoing the Iraq supplemental last week, the President ignored the voices of the American people, his own military generals and this Congress. He

can no longer afford to be that stubborn. The President must work with the Congress to come up with an agreement on how to move forward. He can't believe that this Congress is going to roll over and rubber-stamp his failed policies like past Republican Congresses have done.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats refuse to allow the status quo to continue. It is time we accomplish our mission in Iraq.

NEW DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS PRODUCING POSITIVE RESULTS FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 months, we have taken control of the House, and we have headed in the right direction, bringing back necessary oversight of this administration and producing positive results for the American people, especially as it dealt with the special interest groups.

We got off on a quick start, passing six bills during our first 100 hours that will make college and prescription drugs more affordable and will expand economic opportunities for millions of Americans who have not received a pay raise in the last 9 years. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to indicate to you that we will continue to do that.

We also passed the budget for 2007 that should have been done last year, striking out all earmarks and adding additional money for our veterans, \$3.6 billion.

I am pleased to also announce that we passed a supplemental that added additional money for our veterans, an additional \$1.8 billion for our war veterans. Unfortunately, the President has vetoed this piece of legislation.

We are going to continue to push forward in making sure that we have oversight over these committees.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX

(Mr. REYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to inform my colleagues that the classified annex to H.R. 2082, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008, will be available during regular committee business hours to Members only. Personal staff are requested to call ahead to extension 5-7690 to schedule a viewing for their Member of Congress. Members will be required to fill out the appropriate security paperwork to view the classified documents.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1294, THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1294) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 1294 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman, my good friend from Washington, Representative HASTINGS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 377.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the Clerk just read, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1294, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2007. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairperson and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides something that has been long overdue to six Native American Tribes in Virginia.

After literally centuries of injustice, some 3,175 members of these great tribes will finally gain Federal recognition under this bill. Just like the great Seminole and Micosukee Tribes in south Florida that I am privileged to represent, these six tribes now have the chance to finally receive the proper recognition and respect they rightfully deserve.

Just like the other 562 Federally recognized American Indian tribes in the United States, these tribes will finally have access to basic services, such as child welfare services, adult care and community development, services every one of us in this body take for granted.

Each of these six American Indian tribes descended from the historic tribes that occupied the Virginia coastline in 1607. Their rich history and tradition forever ties them to this land. Over the centuries, they have survived racial hostility and State-sanctioned attempts to stamp out their heritage and cultural identity.

Notwithstanding their ancient bonds to this soil, they continue to walk oppressed among us. The reason for such injustice? Because in the early part of the 19th century, Virginia officials intentionally destroyed the majority of their historical records and artifacts that affirmed the existence of Native Americans in Virginia. Virginia finally recognized them in the 1980s, and it is appropriate and long overdue that Congress is finally following suit.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Native American tribes, whose land was forcibly taken from them centuries ago, are still struggling for their basic rights and freedoms to this day. I ask, does this story of repression, refusal and repudiation not ring true for so many generations of Americans? Now, it takes acts of Congress to give them the recognition they have long deserved.

Legislation providing Federal recognition for these six tribes, the Chickahominy, the Eastern Chickahominy, the Monacan, the Rappahannock and the Mattaponi is today what we seek and what for too long has been denied. I ask again how we reconcile this kind of repression and repudiation.

The Queen of England is in the United States today. Last week, she visited the coastline of Virginia, Jamestown, where many of these people that we seek to get designation for and recognition for today came from, and yet she would not have had an opportunity to see them in their cultural array for the reason that they are not recognized.

Legislation providing Federal recognition for these six tribes has been introduced in both the House and the Senate in every Congress since the 106th, without action. To deny them recognition once more is to perpetuate the tyranny.

The underlying legislation would be a small step in rectifying our Nation's history of suppressing these great peo-

ple. I am proud to support this rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida and namesake, Mr. HASTINGS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule. This closed rule provides for consideration of a bill to Federally recognize six new Indian tribes in the State of Virginia. This bill marks the first time in over 20 years that the House of Representatives has considered legislation to extend Federal recognition to a tribe.

While I will acknowledge Congress can grant Federal recognition to individual tribes, the Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs has the administrative process by which a group may establish itself as an Indian tribe and become eligible for services and benefits extended to other tribes under Federal law.

□ 1245

While each of these six tribes have separately submitted a petition for recognition to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, none of the petitions are complete. Rather than wait for these petitions to go through the administrative process, the Democrat majority has decided to bring this legislation to the floor under a completely closed rule, which allows no input or improvements to be made to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, despite commitments made by the Democrats for a new era of openness, the Rules Committee has only approved one truly open rule that allowed Members of Congress to come to the floor and offer amendments during consideration of a bill. House Resolution 377 is the 18th closed rule brought forth by the Democrat majority, which means that this is the 18th time the Democrat majority has shut Members of Congress out of the deliberative process. So I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 7 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Appropriations Committee and a leader in this fight in each of the Congresses that we have spoken of.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

I would also like to address my good friend from Washington, also Mr. HASTINGS, as well as my friend from Connecticut sitting behind Mr. HASTINGS, because I heard his state-

ment earlier which reflected the statement of the gentleman representing the minority on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address these concerns, legitimate concerns, that have been raised, and explain why I think you would agree that what we are doing today is not only appropriate and proper, but well-justified.

There was a white-tie dinner at the White House last night. The country, particularly Virginia, is celebrating the 400th anniversary of the Jamestown settlement. But these six Indian Tribes are the reason why those English settlers were able to survive. They showed them how to survive. They sheltered them. They taught them how to grow the plants that were native to North America. They took care of them. Subsequently, when the English settlers got on their feet, they displaced these Indians, took their land and treated them pretty badly.

Finally, in 1677 there was a treaty signed with King Charles II. There was no American government at the time. It was the only government that could sign a treaty. It is the oldest Indian treaty in existence today. It continued, that treaty, but the implementation of it did not. The English government, in other words, its settlers here, violated that treaty at every opportunity, diminished these tribes and took their land.

Then, to compound this situation, and to understand why this is a unique situation beyond the 400th anniversary, in 1924 the Commonwealth of Virginia passed what was called the Racial Integrity Act. It was sponsored by a white supremacist who had alliances with the Nazi government in Germany, we understand. It was a very bad time in American history.

This law allowed the Commonwealth of Virginia to destroy the documents that proved the existence of these Native American families. They legally went into the courthouses and destroyed the birth records, they destroyed everything that identified them as Native Americans, and that is why there is a unique situation here. They don't have the documentation that they would need to present to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

This is compounded, of course, by the fact that this recognition process is almost impossible. We wouldn't want to wish it on our worst enemy, to have to go through what Native American tribes now have to go through. It is demeaning and deliberately frustrating. And they were told, well, you might get recognition, but certainly not in your lifetime. These Native Americans have been mistreated by this country.

Now we have compromised. You could say we have unfairly treated them again, but it is the only way to get this recognition through in time for the celebration of the Jamestown settlement.

We said, we are not going to treat you like other Native American tribes. You are not going to be able to have

gambling, to have casinos, to even play bingo. We are going to prohibit it in this legislation, just to reassure people who are concerned about gambling, and understandably, given all of the corruption that has occurred, Jack Abramoff and so on. I don't have to get into all that. We made the compromise, and they reluctantly agreed to it.

Then, even though they have 500 acres that everyone agrees is theirs that should be put into trust, we are going to hold back and require all of the environmental processes and so on to be gone through by the Department of Interior. Whatever that administrative process is, they have to wait and go through all of that in order just to have their own land put into trust. Another compromise.

We have compromised in every way we could. That is the reason for the closed rule. We have talked to everyone that appeared to have any opposition.

Mr. WOLF had legitimate concern about gambling. We tried to bring this to the floor before. He has blocked it. I can understand his concern. But this is a unique situation. We have addressed it. We have addressed that issue on gambling. Mr. WOLF now supports the bill, he has told me.

Mr. YOUNG supports the bill, because he has looked at it extensively. I don't believe my good friend from Connecticut is on the Natural Resources Committee and may not have participated in those discussions, all of those compromises that have led us to this point.

But I think if you look at the justice of this situation, if you look back at the truth of what has occurred to these Indians, you have to come to the conclusion that this is a unique situation. This is justified. In fact, this is urgent.

There are some representatives of the tribes here today. They have been so frustrated, cynical even, disappointed that the Congress won't understand what they understand and what they would like to be able to pass on to their children.

The only people that would ever educate them and their ancestors were Christian missionaries. They were forbidden to go to public schools. They were forbidden to have jobs. They couldn't get their children out of hospitals if they called them an American Indian because they would be subject to a year in prison.

I don't want to go into all of this, because I would like to put this behind us, because it is a very sad chapter of American history. Hopefully that chapter is about to end and a new chapter will begin with this legislation.

That is why I would ask my colleagues, approve this legislation. Do the right thing. Do it in time, so we can honestly celebrate with the people in Jamestown and with these tribes.

These tribes deserve recognition. They deserve to be able to have the kind of pride that they have merited

through their persistence. They are extraordinarily patriotic, loyal to this country, honest and obedient. They are good people. Let's pass this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Virginia laying out his remarks on this and his arguments on this, but it seems to me if there is this much work done with it, we certainly should have an open process because of all the compromises made, rather than a closed process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to Mr. MORAN, I totally trust and understand his sincerity, but everything he said there are significant answers to. And all he has done is raised even more questions. He is basically saying to pass this bill and rush it through the Senate real quickly so we can have this be part of the celebration.

How clever were these six tribes to decide that this is the way they would get it through and bypass the Bureau of Indian Affairs process. With this legislation we are going to create six independent nations within our Nation, and we are now going to go back to bypassing a process and just deciding here in this Chamber.

I have no way of knowing if each of these are a legitimate tribe. There is no way for us in this Chamber to know it. We did that before Republicans were elected, and we stopped the process because we saw bypassing the Bureau of Indian Affairs process was corrupting. It was corrupting because it meant that if you had the influence, even if you didn't meet the standards of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, you could become a tribe.

The fact is that my colleague has said he has dealt with one of the objections. What you have done is dealt with the objection so the bill can pass. But gambling will be alive and well. First the prohibition will be tested in the courts, and the mere fact that my colleague said we are not treating them fairly by taking it out is his next argument to say we have to treat them fairly once they are tribes.

The bottom line is gambling is a license to print money, and the financial instincts and pressures will be so great that to say they will not have gambling is patently laughable. They will have it, if they are a tribe.

The bottom line to me is this: We have a process. We started to go around that process and we started to bring bills forward, and now every State is going to ask the same thing that Mr. MORAN did. The process is too long.

Well, if we don't like the process, fix the process. But we are not capable to decide what tribe should become independent nations within the confines of the United States. We don't have that capability. We have given that process to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and we

need to document it. The fact that these six tribes can't document that they have an historic economic, social and political continuity is significant. It is very significant. They don't even have reservations, a place where they were meeting.

So I can't say how strongly I oppose this legislation. I fear that, however well intended my colleague from Virginia is, he has become the point of the spear that will result in a huge, huge pressure. The tribes in Connecticut, the tribes in Massachusetts, the tribes in New York, those that can't prove that they meet the Federal standard, like these tribes, will come to Congress and say they want the same thing. And our argument disappears, because when this passes, and I think it will, more than 50 percent of our Members will have voted for it, they will not be able to go and say to any tribe, follow the process. They will, in my judgment, have corrupted the process of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and now have no standing to say follow it.

Mr. Speaker, I just urge my colleagues, if you have a tribe, and I speak to all of my colleagues, those that are in this Chamber and those who are not, if you have a tribe that you think is trying to get around the Bureau of Indian Affairs and you vote for this legislation, you will have no standing whatsoever to oppose them. You will now have to be part of corrupting that process, going around and passing a bill on the floor, when we have no capability whatsoever to determine if they are a legitimate Federal tribe, not State tribe, a Federal tribe, proving social, political and economic continuity through historic times.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. I know this: I sure will.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I would ask my friend from Connecticut to listen to my response to the points that he just made because I know he is a fair man. And when he considers the fact that, first of all, the Narragansett Tribe was recognized in the 1990s with a similar prohibition, and they don't gamble.

This particular tribe, they were raised by Christian missionaries. They believe gambling is a sin. They could be operating bingo parlors down the street today. They don't because they believe it is wrong to do so. They don't want to gamble.

But they are unique, and I would say to my friend, in 1912 through 1946, the Bureau of Vital Statistics in Virginia systematically erased all reference to Indians in all public records. That is unique. That hasn't happened in other States. The Governor of Virginia recognizes these tribes. They have been recognized for hundreds of years.

And the fact is, we are not bringing this legislation up all of a sudden now.

This legislation we have been trying for 8 years to get through; 8 years I have sponsored it. But these Indian tribes didn't have any money to influence the process.

The Racial Integrity Act of 1924, and I go back to this, as embarrassed as I am about the fact that it passed the legislature of Virginia, required all persons to register as "white" or "colored" in the language of those days, and it made it a criminal offense for Indians not to so register. That is why they were eliminated in the State. It is what a historian called a paper genocide. That is why this is a very unique situation. It is not all of a sudden. For 8 years, we have been trying to pass this legislation. The Governor recognizes they exist, and it is not about gambling.

It is understandable you would assume it is about gambling. It is not, and we have examples of other tribes that are not gambling today that have similar prohibitions. So I would say to the gentleman, please do the right thing. Read the bill carefully, and I trust you will support it as a result.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Could I ask the gentleman, he mentioned one tribe that he referred to as a Christian tribe, are we recognizing one tribe or six tribes?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. In this case, we are recognizing six. There was one tribe in the 1990s, the Narragansett Tribe, a similar prohibition against gambling was instituted. They don't gamble.

This is about recognition.

Mr. SHAYS. So your reference that one tribe would clearly not want gambling, it is a fact that these tribes did want gambling and the only way you could get this bill through the Chamber was to take it out, and you said on the floor, I think I heard you correctly, that it was an outrage to take it out and it took away their rights and so on.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I didn't use the term "outrage," but I do I think it is unfair. If I were a Native American member of any of these six tribes, I would feel badly that I wasn't treated the way other Native American tribes have been treated. It is a matter of pride and sovereignty, so you can choose not to gamble, not to have Congress say, we don't trust you; we are going to prohibit you from gambling. But it is not their intent to gamble.

Mr. SHAYS. I would just point out to my colleague that a number of tribes said they didn't want gambling, and then when they had the opportunity, they seized it in spite of the fact that they said they didn't want to.

The precedent can be turned over by the court, and it can be changed simply by inserting language in some major appropriation that the tribe can have gambling, and it may not even see the light of day.

The fact that the tribe has sought for years to bypass the Bureau of Indian Affairs only says that they have tried to bypass the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The fact that you have introduced this bill continually only tells me that you have tried to bypass the process.

If the process is not working, change the process.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I again thank my friend and thank you for being able to communicate in this fashion.

The fact is that they have tried for 8 years to get recognition. But when you say that they are bypassing the process, the reason the process doesn't work is, in this case, the Commonwealth of Virginia made it legal to destroy all of the documentation that would have proved their existence. It was legal under the Racial Integrity Act. They went in and destroyed every reference to them.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, as we keep talking about it, more warnings go off to me.

The fact that they would have only tried for the last 8 years to go through this process, it strikes me as extraordinarily arrogant that this tribe, that has only tried for 8 years, should bypass tribes that have tried for much longer than that. And the fact that they are trying now as opposed to in the past tells me that they saw the kind of revenues that existed and said, hey, let's be part of this gravy train. That concerns me as well.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. First of all, it is six tribes. The Governor of Virginia recognizes them, and the Commonwealth of Virginia has recognized them since it did away with the Racial Integrity Act. Senator Allen when he was Governor recognized them because they do exist.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me just point out that States do recognize. But if you establish as a precedent that all tribes recognized by States will get Federal recognition, then you have just included a whole number of Connecticut tribes that will have State recognition. State recognition is different than Federal. Federal has to prove that there is a socioeconomic and political continuity through historical times.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute in order to respond to the gentleman.

And what would be wrong with that? I am reminded of the comedian Flip Wilson who said that when Christopher Columbus discovered America, the Native Americans must have been running down to the shoreline saying, "Discover me."

Enough already. We have abused these people continuously. We put them on reservations, and now we would stand here in this body and argue that they are not entitled to designation? This particular set of tribes, all six of them, have gone to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and sought recognition there. And since the 106th Congress, we have introduced measures here, whether or not they gamble or didn't gamble.

They gamble in Connecticut, and they gamble in Florida. And this crazy Nation is going to gamble its brains out, but it ain't the Indians' fault. And if it is their fault, then they ought to have that right from what we took from them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. This is an important dialogue to have, and I appreciate the candor of the gentleman. What he has basically said is: What's wrong with that?

What is wrong with all of the State-recognized tribes getting Federal recognition in my State, for instance?

I would like all of my State legislators and my senators and my State representatives to hear what you just said because that is what concerns us. There is a lot wrong with that because some of the State-recognized tribes don't meet the standard that we say of a social, political and economic continuity. There were times when they didn't even exist for awhile, but we recognize them on the State level.

I can't emphasize enough that what you are doing is you are opening a huge Pandora's box; and however well intended you are, you have heard the basic argument. Every Member of Congress who has a State-recognized tribe but not a federally recognized tribe, be well aware of what this new Congress is coming from: What's wrong with that? There is a lot wrong with that.

Go through the process. And if the process is not working, change the process. Don't start overriding the Bureau of Indian Affairs and doing it just for a select few.

I want to point out to my colleague, I am not impressed that it was from the 106th Congress. That is just a few years ago. There are others that are going through the process fairly, working hard, and now they are going to say we have been trying since the 103rd and the 105th and 99th.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Washington through the Chair if he has any remaining speakers. I'm the last speaker for this side and I'm prepared to reserve until the gentleman has closed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have no more requests for time, so I'll close.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that the exchange that we have had here back and forth between the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Florida begs to a process

that should be much more open. Clearly there are some issues that were raised.

My friend from Connecticut talked about the process and the fact that this may be bypassing the process. Maybe an open process would have allowed us to pursue that, but we don't have that opportunity. We have a closed rule dealing only with six tribes. I think that is significant.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a majority member of the House Rules Committee in the last Congress, I just want to point out that nearly 16 percent of the rules by that committee in the last Congress were open rules and 84 percent were restrictive or closed.

Thus far in this Congress, the 110th Congress, only 2.5 percent of the rules brought forth by the new Democrat majority on the Rules Committee have been open, while a staggering 97.5 percent have been restricted or closed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the trend we see before us today with yet another closed rule denying Members an opportunity to try to improve legislation does not continue for much longer. However, I must comment that I am more disbelieving with each restrictive and closed rule brought to the floor.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would remind my good friend, I have served with him on the Rules Committee in the minority and in the majority, and he is obviously in his statistics not taking into consideration the preprinting requirements that have been offered.

I would also remind you that no one came to the Rules Committee with reference to any amendment as it pertains to this particular matter that was noticed last week that it was going to be up.

And now I yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate my friend for yielding.

First of all, if there is a preprinting requirement, that means that once that deadline is done and debate starts on the floor, no one can come down and amend the rule. Therefore, it's a closed rule.

Secondly, I can't say for certain, but the exchange that we had down here, a very good exchange, may have brought forward some idea by a Member wanting to come down and at least discuss an amendment. We don't have that opportunity. That is simply the point that I am making. This is a closed rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, in closing now, on behalf of the six tribes that I believe we have a great opportunity today to finally bringing closure to their injustice. Indeed, in my view, Congress has a duty to end the suppression and provide these six Native American Indian tribes with recognition long overdue.

Number one, they were not recognized by the Federal Government. And if they didn't exist for a very long time, it was because of the Federal Government. And then when they tried to come back and say that we are going to meet all of these exacting requirements under the petition, who had destroyed their records, the Virginia government had destroyed their record.

What part of that don't you all understand, that these people can't make something out of whole cloth in a situation where their records have been destroyed?

How vicious can one situation be when you destroy the records of individuals and then ask them to corroborate and prove they exist? That is a virtual impossibility.

In this particular case, if there is one group of Native Americans that deserve an exception, and I might add they would be all six of these in light of the fact that systematically at every courthouse in Virginia every one of their records were burned or destroyed, and that was under the aegis of the authority of the Virginia government.

Give these people a break, if no one else. Now they have made it very clear that they do not intend, they forgo the right to gamble. And all things considered, I don't see my colleague from Connecticut and I don't see any colleagues from California and Nevada and me and others from Florida around turning the revenue back that is being produced. The State of Florida, for example, is about the business of trying to come up with better formulas so they can get more of the revenue that is coming into the Seminole and Miccosukee tribes. I suggest to you that Connecticut probably would be near bankrupt if it hadn't been for the Indian tribes and the revenue that comes into that State.

Somewhere along the line when you have taken from people, you ought to at least give them an opportunity to have the playing field level. And we are talking about in this case only 3,175 members, 562 Federal tribes have already been recognized. And yes, Mr. SHAYS, I think every other one of them ought to be recognized, including my ancestors that are Creek Indians.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Res-

olution 377 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 370.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 186, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Grijalva	Oberstar
Aderholt	Gutierrez	Obey
Allen	Hall (NY)	Olver
Altmire	Hare	Ortiz
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Arcuri	Hereth Sandlin	Pascarell
Baca	Higgins	Pastor
Baird	Hill	Payne
Baldwin	Hinchey	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Bean	Hirono	Pomeroy
Becerra	Hodes	Price (NC)
Berkley	Holden	Rahall
Berman	Holt	Rangel
Berry	Honda	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Hookey	Rodriguez
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Ross
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rothman
Boren	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Boyd (FL)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Boyda (KS)	Jefferson	Salazar
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Linda
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	T.
Butterfield	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Kanjorski	Sarbanes
Capuano	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cardoza	Kennedy	Schiff
Carnahan	Kildee	Schwartz
Carney	Kilpatrick	Scott (GA)
Carson	Kind	Scott (VA)
Castor	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Chandler	Kucinich	Sestak
Clarke	Lampson	Shea-Porter
Clay	Langevin	Sherman
Cleaver	Lantos	Sires
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Skelton
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Levin	Snyder
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Solis
Costello	Lipinski	Space
Courtney	Loeb sack	Spratt
Cramer	Loftgren, Zoe	Stark
Crowley	Lowey	Stupak
Cuellar	Lynch	Sutton
Cummings	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Taylor
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Davis, Tom	McCollum (MN)	Towns
DeFazio	McDermott	Udall (CO)
DeGette	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Delahunt	McIntyre	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McNerney	Velázquez
Dicks	McNulty	Visclosky
Dingell	Meehan	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Donnelly	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Edwards	Melancon	Waters
Ellison	Michaud	Watson
Ellsworth	Miller (NC)	Watt
Emanuel	Miller, George	Waxman
Eshoo	Mitchell	Weiner
Etheridge	Mollohan	Welch (VT)
Farr	Moore (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Filner	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wynn
Gordon	Nadler	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Napolitano	Young (AK)

NAYS—186

Akin	Bilbray	Boustany
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Brown (SC)
Bachus	Blackburn	Brown-Waite,
Baker	Blunt	Ginny
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Buchanan
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Burgess
Barton (TX)	Bono	Burton (IN)
Biggert	Boozman	Buyer

Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Ingilis (SC)
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling

Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Ingilis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts

Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Brown, Corrine
Doyle
Engel
Fattah
Gilchrest
Goode
Harman

Hulshof
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Marchant
Markey
McCotter

McMorris
Rodgers
Ros-Lehtinen
Souder
Sullivan
Tiahrt

□ 1338

Mr. WELLER of Illinois and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WELDON of Florida changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 370, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 197, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markay
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—197

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt

Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)

Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David

Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Ingilis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan

Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam

Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Nunes
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Brown, Corrine
Doyle
Engel
Fattah
Gilchrest

Gutierrez
Hulshof
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lynch

McMorris
Rodgers
Ruppersberger
Souder
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1348

Mr. BILBRAY changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately today, May 8, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes on H. Res. 377 and H. Res. 370.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 305 on passage of H. Res. 377, Providing for the consideration of H.R. 1294, Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act, I would have voted “nay.”

Had I been present for rollcall No. 306 on passage of H. Res. 370, Providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal

year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012, I would have voted "nay."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The text of the Senate concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

Sec. 201. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 202. Point of order against reconciliation legislation that would increase the deficit or reduce a surplus.
Sec. 203. Point of order against legislation increasing long-term deficits.
Sec. 204. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 205. Extension of enforcement of budgetary points of order.
Sec. 206. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 207. Discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 208. Application of previous allocations in the Senate.
Sec. 209. Point of order to Save Social Security First.
Sec. 210. Point of order against legislation that raises income tax rates.
Sec. 211. Circuit breaker to protect Social Security.
Sec. 212. Point of order—20% limit on new direct spending in reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 213. Point of order against legislation that raises income tax rates for small businesses, family farms, or family ranches.
Sec. 214. Point of order against provisions of appropriations legislation that constitutes changes in mandatory programs with net costs.
Sec. 215. Disclosure of interest costs.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ADJUSTMENTS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for SCHIP legislation.

Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for care of wounded service members.

Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief.

Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for comparative effectiveness research.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.

Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Farm Bill.

Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for energy legislation.

Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare.

Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for small business health insurance.

Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for county payments for Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 reauthorization.

Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance reauthorization.

Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for affordable housing.

Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for receipts from Bonneville Power Administration.

Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Indian claims settlement.

Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Food and Drug Administration.

Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care reform.

Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for enhancement of veterans' benefits.

Sec. 318. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for long-term care.

Sec. 319. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health information technology.

Sec. 320. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child care.

Sec. 321. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for comprehensive immigration reform.

Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for mental health parity.

Sec. 323. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for preschool opportunities.

Sec. 324. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the safe importation of FDA-approved prescription drugs.

Sec. 325. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 326. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 327. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

Sec. 328. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for expansion of above-the-line deduction for teacher classroom supplies.

Sec. 329. Adjustment for Smithsonian Institution salaries and expenses.

Sec. 330. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for reduction of improper payments.

Sec. 331. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes.

Sec. 332. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extension of certain energy tax incentives.

Sec. 333. Reserve fund to provide additional training for physicians and attract more physicians in States that face a shortage of physicians in training.

Sec. 334. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for repeal of the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security Benefits.

Sec. 335. Sense of Congress on the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

Sec. 336. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for eliminating military retirement and disability offset.

Sec. 337. Deficit-neutral reserve for asbestos reform legislation.

Sec. 338. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for manufacturing initiatives.

Sec. 339. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for increased use of recovery audits.

Sec. 340. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a delay in the implementation of a proposed rule relating to the Federal-State Financial Partnerships under Medicaid and SCHIP.

Sec. 341. Reserve fund to improve the health care system.

Sec. 342. Reserve fund to improve Medicare hospital payment accuracy.

Sec. 343. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health insurance.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,900,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,008,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,122,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,221,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,357,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,426,691,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: -\$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: -\$41,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$15,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$57,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: -\$36,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: -\$170,405,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,364,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,490,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,506,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,555,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,669,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,696,288,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,298,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,460,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,555,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,587,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,675,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,682,375,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$398,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$451,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$433,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$365,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$317,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$255,684,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$8,960,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$9,529,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$10,079,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$10,562,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$10,993,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$11,375,583,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$5,045,226,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,308,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,537,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$5,686,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$5,769,579,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$5,779,399,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—The amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$637,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$668,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$702,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$737,589,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$772,605,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$807,928,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—The amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$441,676,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$460,224,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$478,578,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$499,655,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$520,743,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$546,082,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,105,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,244,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,444,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,417,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,612,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,583,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,783,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,753,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2007 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$619,363,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,462,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$648,820,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$617,842,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$626,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$545,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$572,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$551,054,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$558,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$559,899,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$551,763,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,015,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,944,400,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,555,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,101,600,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,859,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,497,400,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,376,600,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,335,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology

(250):

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,079,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,516,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,583,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,925,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,289,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,651,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,593,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,958,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,384,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,662,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,142,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,778,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,306,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,032,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,331,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,999,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,624,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,207,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,118,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,390,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,288,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,763,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,566,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,772,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$507,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,282,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,739,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,887,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,721,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,415,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,461,500,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,561,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,921,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,076,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,084,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,780,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,224,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,399,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,948,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,366,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,896,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,650,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,473,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,307,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$268,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,645,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$291,266,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$310,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$308,329,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$333,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,057,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$379,814,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,151,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$365,152,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,180,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$389,969,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$390,035,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$414,779,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$414,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$439,862,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$440,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$484,811,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$481,008,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$480,632,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$379,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$383,609,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$390,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$393,118,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$400,706,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$401,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$415,851,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,874,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$401,275,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$400,684,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,089,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,644,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,518,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,701,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,701,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,898,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,898,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,896,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,262,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,424,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,943,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,559,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,314,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,513,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,957,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,709,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,796,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,090,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,622,900,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,976,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,686,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,583,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,196,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,577,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,758,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,118,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,313,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,657,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,222,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,725,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,606,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,425,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$390,393,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$390,393,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$412,002,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$412,002,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$427,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$427,476,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$438,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$438,455,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,724,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,519,400,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,068,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,935,400,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,823,600,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,574,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,761,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,754,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,458,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,458,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,560,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

SEC. 201. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any 1 of 4 applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any 1 of the 4 following periods:

(A) The current fiscal year.
 (B) The budget year.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year.

(D) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the 5 fiscal years referred to in subparagraph (C).

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **SUNSET.**—This section shall expire on September 30, 2017.

(e) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 505 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the fiscal year 2004 concurrent resolution on the budget, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 202. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in the current fiscal year, the budget year, the period of the first 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year, or the period of the second 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 203. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in deficits in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in fiscal year 2018 through fiscal year 2057.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a net increase in deficits in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in 2018 through 2057.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net

deficit increases shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(e) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 407 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

(f) **SUNSET.**—This section shall expire on September 30, 2017.

SEC. 204. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—With respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that the Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section, except that the authority to designate shall not apply to funding for spinach producers on a supplemental appropriations bill pursuant to subsection (f)(1) that is designated to supplement funding for ongoing combat operations.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and sections 201 and 207 of this resolution (relating to pay-as-you-go in the Senate and discretionary spending limits).

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) **CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY POINTS OF ORDER.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 403 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 403 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress) shall remain in effect for purposes of Senate enforcement through September 30, 2017.

SEC. 206. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **POINT OF ORDER.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2008, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$25,158,000,000 in new budget authority in each year; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (a).

(d) **FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 207. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) **DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(1) for fiscal year 2007, \$951,140,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,029,456,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for fiscal year 2008, \$942,295,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,021,392,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).

(c) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(A) the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Senate Committee on Appropriations may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) **MATTERS DESCRIBED.**—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) **CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates \$264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$213,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed \$213,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(B) **INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates \$6,822,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$406,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed \$406,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(C) **HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to \$383,000,000 to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed \$383,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(D) **UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS REVIEWS.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates \$10,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payments reviews for the Department of Labor, and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$40,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payments reviews for the Department of Labor, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed \$40,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(E) **WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION.**—

(i) **DEFINITION.**—For this subparagraph, the term “base amount” refers to the average of the obligations of the preceding 10 years for wildfire suppression in the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, cal-

culated as of the date of the applicable year's budget request is submitted by the President to Congress.

(ii) **ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.**—If the amount appropriated for Wildland Fire Suppression in fiscal year 2008 is not less than the base amount, then the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate allocations, aggregates, discretionary spending limits, and other budgetary levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides additional funding for wildland fire suppression, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, but not to exceed the following amounts in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom:

(I) for the Forest Service, for fiscal year 2008, \$400,000,000; and

(II) for the Department of the Interior, for fiscal year 2008, \$100,000,000.

(F) **COSTS OF GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR.**—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits for one or more bills, joint resolutions, motions, amendments, or conference reports that make discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or 2009 in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution for expenses related to the global war on terror, but not to exceed the following amounts:

(i) For fiscal year 2008, \$145,162,000,000 in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

(ii) For fiscal year 2009, \$50,000,000,000 in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

(G) **ADJUSTMENT FOR UNITED STATES FORCES IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits for one or more bills, joint resolutions, motions, amendments, or conference reports that make discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for an amount appropriated, but not to exceed \$5,000,000,000 in budgetary authority and outlays flowing therefrom, to—

(i) address training, equipment, force protection, logistics, or other matters necessary for the protection of United States forces; or

(ii) address deficiencies at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and other facilities within the military medical system providing treatment to service members injured while performing their duties in the Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION OF PREVIOUS ALLOCATIONS IN THE SENATE.

Section 7035 of Public Law 109-234 shall no longer apply in the Senate.

SEC. 209. POINT OF ORDER TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit in any fiscal year until the President submits legislation to Congress and Congress enacts legislation which would restore 75-year solvency to the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds as certified by the Social Security Administration actuaries.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 210. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT RAISES INCOME TAX RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report that includes a Federal income tax rate increase. In this subsection, the term “Federal income tax rate increase” means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 211. CIRCUIT BREAKER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) CIRCUIT BREAKER.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit (excluding Social Security) for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, then the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year shall reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of Congressional Budget Office and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years, and shall include such provisions as are necessary to protect Social Security and facilitate deficit reduction, except it shall not contain any reduction in Social Security benefits.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any conference report thereon that fails to reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of Congressional Budget Office and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET RESOLUTION.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget that would increase on-budget deficits relative to the concurrent resolution on the budget in any fiscal year covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget or cause the budget to fail to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(d) SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT DURING WAR OR LOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.—

(1) LOW GROWTH.—If the most recent of the Department of Commerce’s advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth (as measured by real GDP) for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent, this section is suspended.

(2) WAR.—If a declaration of war is in effect, this section is suspended.

(e) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(f) BUDGET YEAR.—In this section, the term “budget year” shall have the same meaning as in section 250(c)(12) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 212. POINT OF ORDER—20% LIMIT ON NEW DIRECT SPENDING IN RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(1) IN THE SENATE.—It shall not be in order to consider any reconciliation bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or any conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that produces an increase in outlays, if—

(A) the effect of all the provisions in the jurisdiction of any committee is to create gross new direct spending that exceeds 20% of the total savings instruction to the committee; or

(B) the effect of the adoption of an amendment would result in gross new direct spending that exceeds 20% of the total savings instruction to the committee.

(2)(A) A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(B) Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(C) If a point of order is sustained under paragraph (1) against a conference report in the Senate, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 213. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT RAISES INCOME TAX RATES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES, FAMILY FARMS, OR FAMILY RANCHES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report that includes a Federal income tax rate increase on incomes generated by small businesses (within the meaning of section 474(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) or family farms or family ranches (within the meaning of section 2032A of such Code) (regardless of the manner by which such businesses, farms and ranches are organized). In this subsection, the term “Federal income tax rate increase” means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly

chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 214. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTES CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any appropriations legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, which includes one or more provisions that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) were they included in legislation other than appropriations legislation, if such provision has a net cost over the total of the period of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, the determination of whether a provision violates paragraph (a) shall be made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—It shall be in order for a Senator to raise a single point of order that several provisions of a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report violate this section. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order. If the Presiding Officer so sustains the point of order as to some of the provisions (including provisions of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Senator raised the point of order, then only those provisions (including provision of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be deemed stricken pursuant to this section. Before the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may move to waive such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions against which the point of order was raised. Such a motion to waive is amendable in accordance with rules and precedents of the Senate. After the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order

is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 215. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that is required to contain the statement described in section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, unless such statement contains a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such legislation for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHIP LEGISLATION.

(a) PRIORITY.—The Senate establishes the following priorities and makes the following findings:

(1) The Senate shall make the enactment of legislation to reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) a top priority for the remainder of fiscal year 2007, during the first session of the 110th Congress.

(2) Extending health care coverage to the Nation's vulnerable uninsured children is an urgent priority for the Senate.

(3) SCHIP has proven itself a successful program for covering previously uninsured children.

(4) More than 6 million children are enrolled in this landmark program, which has enjoyed broad bipartisan support in Congress, among our Nation's governors, and within state and local governments.

(5) SCHIP reduces the percentage of children with unmet health care needs.

(6) Since SCHIP was created, enormous progress has been made in reducing disparities in children's coverage rates.

(7) Uninsured children who gain coverage through SCHIP receive more preventive care and their parents report better access to providers and improved communications with their children's doctors.

(8) Congress has a responsibility to reauthorize SCHIP before the expiration of its current authorization.

(b) RESERVE FUND.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides up to \$50,000,000,000 for reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), if such legislation maintains coverage for those currently enrolled in SCHIP, continues efforts to reach uninsured children who are already eligible for SCHIP or Medicaid but are not enrolled, and supports States in their efforts to move forward in covering more children, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes up to \$20,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012. Among the policy changes that could be considered to achieve offsets to the cost of reauthorizing the State Chil-

dren's Health Insurance Program and expanding coverage for children is an increase in the tobacco products user fee rate with all revenue generated by such increase dedicated to such reauthorization and expansion.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CARE OF WOUNDED SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report which improves the medical care of or disability benefits for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans (including the elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation) or improves the disability evaluations of military personnel or veterans to expedite the claims process, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief, such as enhanced charitable giving from individual retirement accounts, and refundable tax relief and including the reauthorization of the new markets tax credit under section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for an additional 5 years, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that establishes a new federal or public-private initiative for comparative effectiveness research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, including tax legislation, that would make higher education more accessible and more affordable, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(1) reauthorizes the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002;

(2) strengthens our agriculture and rural economies and critical nutrition programs;

(3) provides agriculture-related tax relief;

(4) improves our environment by reducing our Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy through expanded production and use of alternative fuels; or

(5) combines any of the purposes provided in paragraphs (1) through (4);

by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes up to \$15,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, including tax legislation, that would reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy, expand production and use of alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, promote renewable energy development, improve electricity transmission, encourage responsible development of domestic oil and natural gas resources, or reward conservation and efficiency, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

(a) PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that repeals the prohibition in section 1860D-11(i)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-11(i)(1)) while preserving access to prescription drugs and price competition without requiring a particular formulary or instituting a price structure for reimbursement of covered Part D drugs, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and provided further that any savings from the measure are to be used either to improve the Medicare Part D benefit or for deficit reduction.

(b) PHYSICIAN PAYMENTS.—The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases the reimbursement rate for physician services under section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act and that includes financial incentives for physicians to improve the quality and efficiency of items and services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries through the use of consensus-based quality measures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(c) IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE PART D.—The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that makes improvements to the prescription drug benefit under Medicare Part D, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to \$5,000,000,000, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that makes health insurance coverage more affordable or available to small businesses and their employees without weakening rating rules or reducing covered benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COUNTY PAYMENTS FOR SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000 REAUTHORIZATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393), by the amounts provided by that legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed \$440,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2008 and the outlays flowing from that budget authority and \$2,240,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 and the outlays flowing from that budget authority, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE REAUTHORIZATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that provides for a continued Federal role in ensuring the availability of terrorism insurance after the expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would establish an affordable housing fund financed by the housing government-sponsored enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RECEIPTS FROM BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that prohibits the Bonneville Power Administration from making early payments on its Federal Bond Debt to the United States Treasury, by the amounts provided by that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INDIAN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(1) creates an Indian claims settlement fund for trust accounting and management deficiencies related to Individual Indian Moneys and assets; and

(2) extinguishes all claims arising before the date of enactment for losses resulting from accounting errors, mismanagement of assets, or interest owed in connection with Individual Indian Moneys accounts;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to \$8,000,000,000, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to regulate tobacco products and assess user fees on tobacco manufacturers and importers to cover the cost of the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory activities, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM.

If an SCHIP reauthorization bill is enacted, then the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report to improve health care, and provide quality health insurance for the uninsured and underinsured, and protect individuals with current health coverage, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENHANCEMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would enhance benefits for veterans, including services for low-vision and blinded veterans, including GI educational benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LONG-TERM CARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would improve long-term care, enhance the safety and dignity of patients, encourage appropriate use of institutional and non-institutional care, promote quality care, and provide for the cost-effective use of public resources, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides incentives or other support for adoption of modern information technology to improve quality and protect privacy in health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit

over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(b) The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for payments that are based on adherence to accepted clinical protocols identified as best practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD CARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides up to \$5,000,000,000 for the child care entitlement to States, by the amounts provided by such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(1) provides for comprehensive immigration reform;

(2) provides for increased interior enforcement, through an effective electronic employment verification system which accurately establishes the employment authorization of individuals; and

(3) provides for increased border security and enhanced information technology systems;

provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the fiscal year 2008 and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MENTAL HEALTH PARITY.

If the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides parity between health insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2008 and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 323. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCHOOL OPPORTUNITIES.

If the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, reports a bill or a joint resolution, or an amendment is offered in the Senate to such a bill or joint resolution, or a conference report is submitted to the Senate on a such a bill or joint resolution, that augments or establishes a Federal program that provides assistance to States that offer or expand preschool to children of low-income families, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revisit the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution by amounts provided in such measure for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 324. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SAFE IMPORTATION OF FDA-APPROVED PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 325. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 326. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 327. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to that house) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 328. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPANSION OF ABOVE-THE-LINE DEDUCTION FOR TEACHER CLASSROOM SUPPLIES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would permanently extend and increase to \$400 the above-the-line deduction for teacher classroom supplies and expand such deduction to include qualified professional development expenses, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 329. ADJUSTMENT FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the

allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits for one or more bills, joint resolutions, motions, amendments, or conference reports that make discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for an amount appropriated, but not to exceed \$17,000,000 in budgetary authority and outlays flowing therefrom, once the Comptroller General of the United States has submitted a certification to Congress that since April 1, 2007—

(1) the Smithsonian Institution does not provide total annual compensation for any officer or employee of the Smithsonian Institution greater than the total annual compensation of the President of the United States;

(2) the Smithsonian Institution does not provide deferred compensation for any such officer or employee greater than the deferred compensation of the President of the United States;

(3) all Smithsonian Institution travel expenditures conform with Federal Government guidelines and limitations applicable to the Smithsonian Institution; and,

(4) all Smithsonian Institution officers and employees are subject to ethics rules similar to the ethics rules widely applicable to Federal Government employees.

(b) CRITERIA FOR CERTIFICATION.—In making the certification described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States should take into account the following:

(1) The Smithsonian Institution is a premier educational, historical, artistic, research, and cultural organization for the American people.

(2) The Inspector General for the Smithsonian Institution recently issued a report regarding an investigation of unauthorized and excessive authorized compensation, benefits, and expenditures by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

(3) The Inspector General's findings indicate that the actions of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution are not in keeping with the public trust of the office of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

(4) Priority should be given to funding for necessary repairs to maintain and repair Smithsonian Institution buildings and infrastructure and protect America's treasures.

(5) Priority should be given to full funding for the Office of the Inspector General for the Smithsonian Institution so that the American people and Congress have renewed confidence that tax-preferred donations and Federal funds are being spent appropriately and in keeping with the best practices of the charitable sector.

SEC. 330. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR REDUCTION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution upon enactment of legislation that achieves savings by eliminating or reducing improper payments made by agencies reporting improper payments estimates under the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 and uses such savings to reduce the deficit, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 331. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF THE DEDUCTION FOR STATE AND LOCAL SALES TAXES.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide for extension of the deduction for State and

local sales taxes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN ENERGY TAX INCENTIVES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would extend through 2015 energy tax incentives, including the production tax credit for electricity produced from renewable resources, the Clean Renewable Energy Bond program, and the provisions to encourage energy efficient buildings, products and power plants, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 333. RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TRAINING FOR PHYSICIANS AND ATTRACT MORE PHYSICIANS IN STATES THAT FACE A SHORTAGE OF PHYSICIANS IN TRAINING.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides additional training for physicians and attracts more physicians in States that face a shortage of physicians in training, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 334. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF THE 1993 INCREASE IN THE INCOME TAX ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would repeal the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security benefits, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Control of illegal immigration is a Federal responsibility.

(2) The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (referred to in this section as "SCAAP") carried out pursuant to section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)) provides critical funding to States and localities for reimbursement of costs incurred as a result of housing undocumented criminal aliens.

(3) Congress appropriated \$300,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for those costs in fiscal year 2004.

(4) Congress appropriated \$305,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for those costs in fiscal year 2005.

(5) Congress appropriated \$405,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for those costs in fiscal year 2006.

(6) Congress appropriated \$399,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for those costs in fiscal year 2007.

(7) Congress has authorized to be appropriated \$950,000,000 to carry out SCAAP for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the budgetary totals in this resolution assume that \$950,000,000 should be made available for SCAAP for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 336. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ELIMINATING MILITARY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY OFFSET.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would expand eligibility for Combat-Related Special Compensation to permit additional disabled retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay, by the amounts provided by such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 337. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FOR ASBESTOS REFORM LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report regarding asbestos reform, that—

(i) either provides monetary compensation to impaired victims of mesothelioma or provides monetary compensation to impaired victims of asbestos-related disease who can establish that asbestos exposure is a substantial contributing factor in causing their condition,

(ii) does not provide monetary compensation to unimpaired claimants or those suffering from a disease who cannot establish that asbestos exposure was a substantial contributing factor in causing their condition, and

(iii) is estimated to remain funded from nontaxpayer sources for the life of the fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2057.

SEC. 338. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MANUFACTURING INITIATIVES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, including tax legislation, that would revitalize the United States domestic manufacturing sector by increasing Federal research and development, by expanding the scope and effectiveness of manufacturing programs across the Federal government, by increasing support for development of alternative fuels and leap-ahead automotive and energy technologies, and by establishing tax incentives to encourage the continued production in the United States of advanced technologies and the infrastructure to support such technologies, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 339. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASED USE OF RECOVERY AUDITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution upon enactment of legislation that achieves savings by requiring that agencies increase their use of the recovery audits authorized by the Erroneous Payments Recovery Act of 2001 (section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002) and uses such savings to reduce the deficit, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 340. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A DELAY IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROPOSED RULE RELATING TO THE FEDERAL-STATE FINANCIAL PARTNERSHIPS UNDER MEDICAID AND SCHIP.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for a delay in the implementation of the proposed rule published on January 18, 2007, on pages 2236 through 2248 of volume 72, Federal Register (relating to parts 433, 447, and 457 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations) or any other rule that would affect the Medicaid program and SCHIP in a similar manner, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 341. RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.

If the Senate Committee on Finance—

(1) reports a bill, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that—

(A) creates a framework and parameters for the use of Medicare data for the purpose of conducting research, public reporting, and other activities to evaluate health care safety, effectiveness, efficiency, quality, and resource utilization in Federal programs and the private health care system; and

(B) includes provisions to protect beneficiary privacy and to prevent disclosure of proprietary or trade secret information with respect to the transfer and use of such data; and

(2) is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974,

the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise allocations of new budget authority and outlays, the revenue aggregates, and other appropriate measures to reflect such legislation provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2008, and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 342. RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE MEDICARE HOSPITAL PAYMENT ACCURACY.

If the Senate Committee on Finance—

(1) reports a bill, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that—

(A) addresses the wide and inequitable disparity in the reimbursement of hospitals under the Medicare program;

(B) includes provisions to reform the area wage index used to adjust payments to hospitals under the Medicare hospital inpatient prospective payment system under section 1886(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)); and

(C) includes a transition to the reform described in subparagraph (B); and

(2) is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974,

the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise allocations of new budget authority and outlays, the revenue aggregates, and other appropriate measures to reflect such legislation provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 343. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH INSURANCE.

If a Senate committee reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that, with appropriate protections for consumers, reduces growth in the number of uninsured Americans, im-

proves access to affordable and meaningful health insurance coverage, improves health care quality, or reduces growth in the cost of private health insurance by facilitating market-based pooling, including across State lines, and a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that, with appropriate protections for consumers, provides funding for State high risk pools or financial assistance, whether directly, or through grants to States to enhance the effectiveness of such pooling or to provide other assistance to small businesses or individuals, including financial assistance, for the purchase of private insurance coverage, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 99, as adopted by the House, is adopted and the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2007 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 202. Reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax.

Sec. 203. Reserve fund to provide for middle-income tax relief and economic equity.

Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.

Sec. 205. Reserve fund for higher education.

Sec. 206. Reserve fund for improvements in medicare.

Sec. 207. Reserve fund for creating long-term energy alternatives.

Sec. 208. Reserve fund for affordable housing.

Sec. 209. Reserve fund for equitable benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II.

Sec. 210. Reserve fund for Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act reauthorization.

Sec. 211. Reserve fund for receipts from the Bonneville Power Administration.

Sec. 212. Reserve fund for Transitional Medical Assistance.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Program integrity initiatives.

Sec. 302. Advance appropriations.

Sec. 303. Overseas deployments and emergency needs.

- Sec. 304. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 305. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 306. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
- Sec. 307. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY

- Sec. 401. Policy on middle-income tax relief.
- Sec. 402. Policy on defense priorities.
- Sec. 403. Policy on college affordability.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

- Sec. 501. Sense of the House on servicemembers' and veterans' health care and other priorities.
- Sec. 502. Sense of the House on the Innovation Agenda: A commitment to competitiveness to keep America #1.
- Sec. 503. Sense of the House on homeland security.
- Sec. 504. Sense of the House regarding the ongoing need to respond to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.
- Sec. 505. Sense of the House regarding long-term sustainability of entitlements.
- Sec. 506. Sense of the House regarding the need to maintain and build upon efforts to fight hunger.
- Sec. 507. Sense of the House regarding affordable health coverage.
- Sec. 508. Sense of the House regarding extension of the statutory pay-as-you-go rule.
- Sec. 509. Sense of the House on long-term budgeting.
- Sec. 510. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.
- Sec. 511. Sense of the House regarding waste, fraud, and abuse.
- Sec. 512. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.
- Sec. 513. Sense of the House on State veterans cemeteries.

TITLE VI—RECONCILIATION

- Sec. 601. Reconciliation.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,904,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,050,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,106,926,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,163,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,394,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,597,096,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,380,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,495,291,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,516,301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,569,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,684,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,716,188,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,300,065,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,465,888,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,565,305,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,600,718,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,691,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,700,809,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$395,359,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$415,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$458,379,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$436,997,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$296,807,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$103,713,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$8,927,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,461,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,036,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,591,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,001,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,231,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: \$5,042,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,269,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,524,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$5,743,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$5,805,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$5,663,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2007 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$525,797,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$534,270,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$506,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$514,401,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$534,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,384,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$545,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$536,433,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$550,944,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$547,624,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$559,799,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$548,169,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,795,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,557,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,083,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,613,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,079,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,516,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,611,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,472,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,641,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,411,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,103,00,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,438,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,367,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,943,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,092,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,051,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,454,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,641,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,228,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,307,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,997,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,152,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,543,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,738,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,549,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,138,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,156,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,863,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,973,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$996,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,822,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,097,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$80,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$86,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$78,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$87,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$79,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$88,761,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,131,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$91,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$96,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$98,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$96,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$98,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$97,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$98,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$96,909,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$267,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$268,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$286,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$307,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$305,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$325,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$325,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$347,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$346,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$370,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$369,739,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$365,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$370,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$389,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$389,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$416,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$416,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$442,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$442,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$489,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$489,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$468,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$486,440,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$360,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$364,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$379,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$383,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$391,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$393,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$401,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$402,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$417,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$416,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$402,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$402,130,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,898,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$73,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$85,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$82,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$87,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$87,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$89,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$96,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$93,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,599,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$47,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$48,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$49,207,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,193,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$344,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$344,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$369,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$369,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$389,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$389,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$413,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$413,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$431,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$431,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$442,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$442,528,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$30,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,860,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$124,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$145,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$114,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$109,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$42,324,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$13,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$4,485,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment to or a conference report submitted on such a bill or joint resolution) reported from the Committee on Energy and Commerce that increases new budget authority that would result in no more than \$50,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for expanding coverage and improving children's health through the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) under title XXI of the Social Security Act and the program under title XIX of such Act (commonly known as Medicaid), the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in budget authority and outlays of other committees as may be necessary pursuant to such adjustment for the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

In the House, with respect to any bill or joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reducing the tax burden of the alternative minimum tax on middle-income families, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bills or joint resolutions (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such bills or joint resolutions is filed, such bills or joint resolutions are placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such bills or joint resolutions.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF AND ECONOMIC EQUITY.

In the House, with respect to any bill or joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for tax relief for middle-income families and taxpayers and enhanced economic equity, such as extension of the child tax credit, extension of marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, modification of the Alternative Minimum Tax, elimination of estate taxes

on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bills or joint resolutions (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such bills or joint resolutions are placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such bills or joint resolutions.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for the reauthorization of the programs of the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 or prior Acts, authorizes similar programs, or both, that increases new budget authority by no more than \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 205. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that makes college more affordable through reforms to the Higher Education Act of 1965, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 206. RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN MEDICARE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that improves the Medicare program for beneficiaries and protects access to care, through measures such as increasing the reimbursement rate for physicians while protecting beneficiaries from associated premium increases and mak-

ing improvements to the prescription drug program under part D, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 207. RESERVE FUND FOR CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that fulfills the purposes of section 301(a) of H.R. 6, the Clean Energy Act of 2007:

(1) The chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments made under this paragraph may be made whenever a rule is filed for a bill or joint resolution that attributes the offsets included in H.R. 6 to the bill or joint resolution.

(2) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make appropriate adjustments to the allocations provided for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations to the extent a bill or joint resolution in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules provides budget authority for purposes set forth in section 301(a) of H.R. 6 in excess of the amounts provided for those purposes in fiscal year 2007. Any adjustments made under this paragraph shall not include revenues attributable to changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and shall not exceed the receipts estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that are attributable to H.R. 6 for the year in which the adjustments are made.

SEC. 208. RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for an affordable housing fund, offset by reforming the regulation of certain government-sponsored enterprises, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND FOR EQUITABLE BENEFITS FOR FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that would provide for or increase benefits to Filipino veterans of World War II, their survivors and dependents, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 210. RESERVE FUND FOR SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Public Law 106-393), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR RECEIPTS FROM THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that prohibits the Bonneville Power Administration from making early payments on its Federal Bond Debt to the Department of the Treasury, the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program, included in title 19 of the Social Security

Act, through fiscal year 2008, the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**—

(1) **CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates \$264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$213,000,000 and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(2) **INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to \$6,822,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$406,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(3) **HEALTHCARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to \$183,000,000 and the amount is designated to the healthcare fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(4) **UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates \$10,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$40,000,000 and the amount is designated for unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(b) **PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **CHAIRMAN.**—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, or the offering of an

amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority.

(B) **MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.**—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(ii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in this resolution.

(C) **OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.**—In the House, all committees are directed to review programs within their jurisdiction to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in program spending, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by Government Accountability Office reports. Based on these oversight efforts and committee performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 302. ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, or an amendment thereto may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) **ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.**—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2009 or 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$25,558,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2008.

SEC. 303. OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) **OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.**—In the House, any bill or joint resolution or amendment offered or considered as adopted or a conference report thereon, that makes appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 for overseas deployments and related activities, and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority, outlays or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) **EMERGENCY NEEDS.**—In the House, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment offered or considered as adopted or conference report thereon, that makes appropriations for nondefense discretionary amounts, and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs, then the new budget authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not be counted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 304. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 305. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect on September 30, 2002).

SEC. 306. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House and the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 307. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE IV—POLICY**SEC. 401. POLICY ON MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF.**

It is the policy of this resolution to minimize fiscal burdens on middle-income families and their children and grandchildren. It is the policy of this resolution to provide immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households who would otherwise be subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) under current law in the context of permanent, revenue-neutral AMT reform. Furthermore, it is the policy of this resolution

to support extension of middle-income tax relief and enhanced economic equity through policies such as—

(1) extension of the child tax credit;

(2) extension of marriage penalty relief;

(3) extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket;

(4) elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified tax credit;

(5) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

(6) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes;

(7) extension of the deduction for small business expensing; and

(8) enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds.

This resolution assumes the cost of enacting such policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations, economic efficiency, higher rates of tax compliance to close the “tax gap”, and reduced taxpayer burdens through tax simplification.

SEC. 402. POLICY ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission) to fund cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs at a level commensurate with the risk is a high priority, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding for these programs;

(2) ensuring that the TRICARE fees for military retirees under the age of 65 remain at current levels;

(3) funds be provided for increasing pay to ensure retention of experienced personnel and for improving military benefits in general;

(4) the Missile Defense Agency should be funded at an adequate but lower level and the elimination of space-based interceptor development will ensure a more prudent acquisition strategy, yet still support a robust ballistic missile defense program;

(5) satellite research, development, and procurement be funded at a level below the amount requested for fiscal year 2008, which amounts to a 26 percent increase above the current level, but at a level sufficient to develop new satellite technologies while ensuring a more prudent acquisition strategy;

(6) sufficient resources be provided to implement Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommendations, such as improving financial management and contracting practices at the Department of Defense (DOD), and that substantial savings should result from the identification of billions of dollars of obligations and disbursements and Government overcharges for which the Department of Defense cannot account;

(7) that the Department of Defense should do a more careful job of addressing the 1,378 Government Accountability Office recommendations made to the Department of Defense and its components over the last six years that have yet to be implemented, which could produce billions of dollars in savings; and

(8) accruing all savings from the actions recommended in paragraphs (4) through (7) should be used to fund higher priorities within Function 050 (Defense), and especially those high priorities identified in paragraphs (1) through (3) and to help fund recommendations of the bipartisan “Walter Reed Commission” (the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors) and other United States Government investigations into military healthcare facilities and services.

SEC. 403. POLICY ON COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation directive to the Committee on Education and Labor shall not be construed to reduce any assistance that makes college more affordable for students, including but not limited to assistance to student aid programs run by nonprofit state agencies.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE**SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SERVICEMEMBERS' AND VETERANS' HEALTH CARE AND OTHER PRIORITIES.**

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House supports excellent health care for current and former members of the United States Armed Services, who have served well and honorably and have made significant sacrifices for this Nation;

(2) this resolution provides \$43,055,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for 2008 for Function 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services), including veterans' health care, which is \$6,598,000,000 more than the 2007 level, \$5,404,000,000 more than the Congressional Budget Office's baseline level for 2008, and \$3,506,000,000 more than the President's budget for 2008;

(3) this resolution provides funding to implement, in part, recommendations of the bipartisan “Walter Reed Commission” (the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors) and other United States Government investigations into military and veterans health care facilities and services;

(4) this resolution assumes the rejection of the enrollment fees and co-payment increases in the President's budget;

(5) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to research and treat veterans' mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain and spinal cord injuries; and

(6) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the speed and accuracy of its processing of disability compensation claims, including funding to hire additional personnel above the President's requested level.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE INNOVATION AGENDA: A COMMITMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS TO KEEP AMERICA #1.

(a) It is the sense of the House to provide sufficient funding that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation and economic growth. This resolution provides \$450,000,000 above the President's requested level for 2008, and additional amounts in subsequent years in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) and Function 270 (Energy). Additional increases for scientific research and education are included in Function 500 (Education, Employment, Training, and Social Services), Function 550 (Health), Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources), Function 350 (Agriculture), Function 400 (Transportation), and Function 370 (Commerce and Housing Credit), all of which receive more funding than the President requested.

(b) America's greatest resource for innovation resides within classrooms across the country. The increased funding provided in this resolution will support important initiatives to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, and place highly qualified teachers in math and science K-12 classrooms.

(c) Independent scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and future technologies. This resolution will put us on the path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in

the physical sciences across all agencies, and collaborative research partnerships; and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

SEC. 503. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2008 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution assumes funding above the President's requested level for 2008, and additional amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions: Function 400 (Transportation), Function 450 (Community and Regional Development), Function 550 (Health), and Function 750 (Administration of Justice) that fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system, particularly our ports where significant security shortfalls still exist and foreign ports, by expanding efforts to identify and scan all high-risk United States-bound cargo, equip first responders, strengthen border patrol, and increase the preparedness of the public health system.

SEC. 504. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE ONGOING NEED TO RESPOND TO HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA.

It is the sense of the House that:

(1) Critical needs in the Gulf Coast region should be addressed without further delay. The budget resolution creates a reserve fund that would allow for affordable housing that may be used to focus on areas devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as well as new funding for additional recovery priorities.

(2) Additional oversight and investigation is needed to ensure that recovery efforts are on track, develop legislation to reform the contracting process, and better prepare for future disasters. Those efforts should be made in close consultation with residents of affected areas. The budget resolution provides additional 2007 funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, some of which may be used for this purpose.

SEC. 505. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF ENTITLEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The aging of the United States population is going to put unprecedented pressure on the Nation's retirement and health care systems.

(2) The long-term strength of social security would be improved through a fiscally responsible policy of reducing the deficit and paying down the debt that has accumulated since 2001, thus reducing debt service payments and freeing up billions of dollars that can be dedicated to meeting social security's obligations.

(3) A policy of reducing and eventually eliminating the deficit and paying down the debt is a key factor in improving the long-term strength of the economy as a whole, because a lower debt burden frees up resources for productive investments that will result in higher economic growth, provide a higher standard of living for future generations, and enhance the Nation's ability to meet its commitments to its senior citizens.

(4) The most significant factor affecting the Nation's entitlement programs is the rapid increase in health care costs. The projected increasing costs of medicare and medicaid are not unique to these programs but rather are part of a pattern of rising costs for the health sector as a whole.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the growing cost of entitle-

ments should be addressed in a way that is fiscally responsible and promotes economic growth, that addresses the causes of cost growth in the broader health care system, and that protects beneficiaries without leaving a legacy of debt to future generations.

SEC. 506. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AND BUILD UPON EFFORTS TO FIGHT HUNGER.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 35 million individuals (12.4 million of them children) are food insecure, uncertain of having, or unable to acquire enough food. 10.8 million Americans are hungry because of lack of food.

(2) Despite the critical contributions of the Department of Agriculture nutrition programs and particularly the food stamp program that significantly reduced payment error rates while increasing enrollment to partially mitigate the impact of recent increases in the poverty rate, significant need remains.

(3) Nearly 25 million people, including nine million children and three million seniors, sought emergency food assistance from food pantries, soup kitchens, shelters, and local charities last year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Department of Agriculture programs that help fight hunger should be maintained and that the House should seize opportunities to enhance those programs to reach people in need and to fight hunger.

SEC. 507. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH COVERAGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 46 million Americans, including nine million children, lack health insurance. People without health insurance are more likely to experience problems getting medical care and to be hospitalized for avoidable health problems.

(2) Most Americans receive health coverage through their employers. A major issue facing all employers is the rising cost of health insurance. Small businesses, which have generated most of the new jobs annually over the last decade, have an especially difficult time affording health coverage, due to higher administrative costs and fewer people over whom to spread the risk of catastrophic costs. Because it is especially costly for small businesses to provide health coverage, their employees make up a large proportion of the nation's uninsured individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that legislation consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle should be adopted that makes health insurance more affordable and accessible, with attention to the special needs of small businesses, and that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care by encouraging integration of health information technology tools into the practice of medicine, and promoting improvements in disease management and disease prevention.

SEC. 508. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE.

It is the sense of the House that in order to reduce the deficit Congress should extend PAYGO in its original form in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

SEC. 509. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

It is the sense of Congress that the determination of the congressional budget for the United States Government and the President's budget request should include consideration of the Financial Report of the United States Government, especially its informa-

tion regarding the Government's net operating cost, financial position, and long-term liabilities.

SEC. 510. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 511. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

It is the sense of the House that all committees should examine programs within their jurisdiction to identify wasteful and fraudulent spending. To this end, section 301 of this resolution includes cap adjustments to provide appropriations for three programs that accounted for a significant share of improper payments reported by Federal agencies in 2006: Social Security Administration Continuing Disability Reviews, the Medicare/Medicaid Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program, and Unemployment Insurance. Section 301 also includes a cap adjustment for the Internal Revenue Services for tax compliance efforts to close the \$300,000,000,000 tax gap. In addition, the resolution's deficit-neutral reserve funds require authorizing committees to cut lower priority and wasteful spending to accommodate new high-priority entitlement benefits. Finally, section 301 of the resolution directs all committees to review the performance of programs within their jurisdiction and report recommendations annually to the Committee on the Budget as part of the views and estimates process required by section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act.

SEC. 512. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 513. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES.

It is the sense of the House that the Federal Government should pay the plot allowance for the interment in a State veterans cemetery of any spouse or eligible child of a veteran, consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle.

TITLE VI—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 601. RECONCILIATION.

(a) INSTRUCTIONS.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws to reduce the deficit by \$75,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(b) MANDATORY SAVINGS.—Not later than September 10, 2007, the House Committee on Education and Labor shall submit its recommendations to the House of Representatives.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the submission to the House of a reconciliation bill or conference report thereon, that complies with this reconciliation instruction, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations and budgetary aggregates. Such revisions shall be considered to be the allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 207, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—212

Abercrombie	Hare	Olver
Ackerman	Harman	Ortiz
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Altmore	Herseth Sandlin	Pascrell
Andrews	Higgins	Pastor
Arcuri	Hinche	Payne
Baca	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Baird	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Hodes	Pomeroy
Becerra	Holden	Price (NC)
Berkley	Holt	Rahall
Berman	Honda	Rangel
Berry	Hooley	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Ross
Blumenauer	Israel	Rothman
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Boyd (FL)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Boyd (KS)	Jefferson	Salazar
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	T.
Capps	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kanjorski	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kennedy	Schiff
Carney	Kildee	Schwartz
Carson	Kilpatrick	Scott (GA)
Castor	Kind	Scott (VA)
Chandler	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Clarke	Lampson	Sestak
Clay	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cleaver	Lantos	Sherman
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Conyers	Lee	Slaughter
Cooper	Levin	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Costello	Lipinski	Solis
Courtney	Loeb	Space
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Crowley	Lowe	Stark
Cuellar	Lynch	Stupak
Cummings	Mahoney (FL)	Sutton
Davis (AL)	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Davis (CA)	Markey	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Taylor
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McDermott	Tierney
Delahunt	McGovern	Towns
DeLauro	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Dicks	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Dingell	McNulty	Van Hollen
Doggett	Meehan	Velázquez
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Melancon	Wasserman
Eshoo	Michaud	Schultz
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watson
Filner	Mollohan	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Gillibrand	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Gordon	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Green, Al	Nadler	Woolsey
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wu
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Yarmuth
Hall (NY)	Obey	

NAYS—207

Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Bachmann	Biggart	Bono
Bachus	Bilbray	Boozman
Baker	Bilirakis	Boren
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Boustany
Barrow	Blackburn	Brady (TX)

Brown (SC)	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Petri
Ginny	Hensarling	Pickering
Buchanan	Herger	Pitts
Burgess	Hill	Platts
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Poe
Buyer	Hoekstra	Porter
Calvert	Hunter	Price (GA)
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Price (OH)
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Putnam
Cannon	Jindal	Radanovich
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Carter	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
Castle	Jordan	Reichert
Chabot	Keller	Renzi
Coble	King (IA)	Reynolds
Cole (OK)	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kirk	Rogers (MI)
Cubin	Kline (MN)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (KY)	Kucinich	Roskam
Davis, David	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	Lamborn	Sali
Deal (GA)	Latham	Saxton
Dent	LaTourette	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Donnelly	Linder	Shadegg
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Shays
Drake	Lucas	Shimkus
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Shuler
Duncan	E.	Shuster
Ehlers	Mack	Simpson
Ellsworth	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Emerson	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
English (PA)	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Everett	Matheson	Stearns
Fallin	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Ferguson	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Flake	McCotter	Terry
Forbes	McCrery	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHenry	Tiberi
Fossella	McHugh	Turner
Fox	McKeon	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Galegley	Miller (MI)	Walsh (NY)
Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Gerlach	Mitchell	Weldon (FL)
Gillmor	Moran (KS)	Weller
Gingrey	Murphy, Patrick	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Murphy, Tim	Whitfield
Goode	Musgrave	Wicker
Goodlatte	Myrick	Wilson (NM)
Granger	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Graves	Nunes	Wolf
Hall (TX)	Paul	Young (AK)
Hastert	Pearce	Young (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Pence	

NOT VOTING—13

Brown, Corrine	Feeney	McMorris
Butterfield	Gilchrest	Rodgers
Doyle	Hulshof	Ruppersberger
Engel	Johnson, E. B.	Souder
Fattah		Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

Mr. BERMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, was concurred in. 200-205

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Spratt moves that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the managers of the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 21, be instructed to:

(A) Recede from the revenue levels set forth in the House amendment; insist on the policy statement in section 401 of the House amendment to support the extension of such tax provisions as the child tax credit, extension of marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes; and recede to section 210 of the Senate resolution which prohibits consideration of an increase in Federal income tax rates;

(B) Insist on the lowest possible levels of revenue within the scope of the conference in fiscal years 2011 and 2012; and make any commensurate adjustments in outlay levels; and

(C) Set forth a unified surplus of at least \$96 billion in fiscal year 2012 in resolving the differences between section 101(4) of the House amendment and section 101(4) of the Senate resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion we are offering today reflects a very simple up or down choice: One, rejecting the largest tax increase in our Nation's history, which is contained in the House budget; two, insisting on the lowest possible level of taxes available in the budget conference; and three, stopping the raid on Social Security's cash surpluses.

Both the House and the Senate Democrat budgets call for historic tax increases, and we in the minority can't do anything to prevent that. But we hope that, with this vote, we can at least minimize the damage that these tax hikes will bring.

Let me take a moment to describe the options that we have to work with as a minority. The House-passed budget would impose a tax hike of \$392 billion from such things as reimposing

the tax penalty on married couples, cutting in half the child tax credit, and raising marginal income tax rates on low- and middle-income working families.

This would increase the average family's tax bill by roughly \$2,900 a year and likely reverse the economic progress we have achieved over the past few years. So, right along with their higher tax bill, Americans would see fewer jobs and slower wage growth.

This massive tax increase was the only way the House Democrats could accomplish their massive increase in spending. Their budget makes no effort, none, to moderate the growth of spending. It simply requires taxpayers to send more of their money to make the Democrats' budget numbers add up.

In our debate a few weeks ago, the Democrats tried gamely to assert that their budget doesn't increase taxes after all. And as proof, they pointed to the novel policy language that claims that they will extend some of the tax relief provisions enacted in 2001 and 2003. They have these reserve funds that say they don't really want to raise taxes. But if you read the fine print, this would only happen later and only if they hike some other taxes by the same amount. So even with the flowery reserve fund language, the goal, the preference of not raising taxes can only be met if they raise taxes.

But the numbers in this budget tell a very different story. By the numbers, which is what a budget is all about, the House budget raises taxes nearly \$400 billion, and numbers do not lie.

The other option is the Senate budget, which raises taxes by about \$216 billion, the second largest tax increase in American history. This will include higher taxes on middle-income earners because the Senate budget still raises marginal income tax rates across the board. But at least it attempts to protect the marriage penalty relief, child tax credit and estate tax relief.

Unfortunately, the other Chamber, like their Democrat counterparts in the House, also call for large spending increases. And as a consequence, their budget will continue to raid the Social Security trust funds in fiscal year 2012, something the House-passed budget and the Republican substitute did not do.

So while the Democrat budget in the Senate didn't raise as many taxes, it did raid the Social Security trust fund, and the House Republican and the House Democrat budget resolution did not.

So, what we are simply trying to do is get the best of both products such that it can be had. Accordingly, our motion would simply direct the conferees to do two things: First, reject the House's \$392 billion tax increase, again, the largest tax increase in American history, and keep their tax hike to the lowest possible level permitted under the rules. Second, insist on the lowest possible level of taxes between the House-passed and Senate-

passed Democrat budgets. This language is included because the motion is required to stay within the scope of the two budgets. We wish we could do more, but this is the scope we have been dealt. Third, it would direct the conferees to stop raiding Social Security for the government's operating budget. They should do this by running a unified surplus, including Social Security, of \$96 billion in fiscal year 2012, which is equal to the Social Security cash surplus for that year.

We know that this is possible because we proved it could be done in our own budget. Our Republican budget not only balanced the budget without raising anyone's taxes, we ran a surplus that ensured the Social Security trust funds would not be raided.

So, again, today we are simply asking our Democratic colleagues to do the following: one, reject the largest tax increase in American history; and two, stop the raid of the Social Security cash surplus.

This is a simple choice. A "yes" vote supports these objectives. A "no" vote rejects them.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say from the outset what we said yesterday in the debate of this bill. But let me refer to third parties, independent, disinterested third parties like the Concord Coalition. They took a look at our budget, and they said unequivocally, and I'm quoting, "Thus, to be clear, the budget resolution does not call for or require a tax increase."

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, excellent analytical work, they took a look at our budget and they said, "The House budget does not include a tax increase."

And then, finally, the Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution, independent, disinterested said, plainly, simply, "This budget would not raise taxes."

We have included in the budget resolution not one place, but twice, in different parts of the resolution, our wholehearted endorsement, our commitment, our pledge, our determination to see that these middle-income tax cuts are preserved and enacted and carried forward when they expire per their terms.

The budget resolution does not cause them to expire. They were designed to expire, written to expire when they were offered and passed. At that particular time, that was part of the provision.

□ 1415

In addition, I am making clear again that our budget resolution allows all of the deductions, credits, exemptions and exclusions that are provided in the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. All of them are provided and allowed to stay in place this year, next year, and for the next 4 years. So there is very little disagree-

ment about us except I am wondering about the arithmetic.

Budget resolution motions to instruct are nonbinding. They are a valid part of the process. But they do present a problem. They single out specific elements of a budget resolution without looking at how one goal, such as tax reduction, interacts with another goal, such as deficit reduction. In that respect, what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have offered is a resolution that calls for support of all of the tax cuts they laid out plus a surplus of \$96 billion.

Could I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, what does this assume about the bottom line before the tax cuts? How big a surplus would you have to have in 2012 in order for there to be, after taking these tax cuts, a \$96 billion remaining surplus?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. This assumes a \$96 billion unified budget surplus after those tax cuts are extended.

Mr. SPRATT. How much?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. A \$96 billion cash surplus unified budget after the extension of those taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. So what is the surplus before these tax cuts are taken?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I don't know off the top of my head.

Mr. SPRATT. It would have to be pretty substantial. Isn't the cost of these tax cuts in the first year \$180 billion or more?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman's budget resolution that passed the House had, I think, about a \$150 billion cash surplus and raised all those taxes; so he had a sizable surplus.

Mr. SPRATT. It's my understanding, roughly speaking, that the cost of these tax cuts, the revenue impact of these tax cuts, in the first year was about \$180 billion. If you take that kind of charge against the surplus and still have a surplus left of \$96 billion, then you've got about a \$276 billion surplus in that year.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield, not only did the Republican budget substitute accommodate for that, it accommodated for an extension of all of the tax cuts that expire in 2010 in addition to having a surplus equal to or greater than the unified Social Security cash surplus. So the Republican budget substitute accommodated all of these tax cuts and stopped the raid on Social Security.

Mr. SPRATT. Is this the CBO number?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SPRATT. CBO's projection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SPRATT. And what you would then expect is a \$276 billion surplus before the tax cuts?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I can't speak to that number. I don't know that number off the top of my head.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Republican motion to instruct conferees on the fiscal year 2008 budget. This budget motion rests on one simple premise: to reject the largest tax increase in American history contained in the Democrats' House-passed budget.

By not addressing the Bush tax cuts, the Democratic budget resolution calls for a \$393 billion tax hike, Mr. Speaker. In my home State of South Carolina, approximately 1.5 million people will see an average \$2,400 increase in their tax bills. In my district alone, about 2,448 people will be forced to pay higher taxes, and estimates indicate a \$182 million loss to the local economy, which translates in about 2,200 jobs being lost.

Mr. Speaker, the government spends too much money as it is. I can't imagine what it would be like with an additional \$400 billion of spending. We have serious challenges facing this Nation and more money is not the solution. Instead of increasing the burden on American citizens, we have an obligation to find real workable solutions.

The Republican motion to instruct calls for a simple up-or-down vote on whether Congress should increase taxes on working Americans by \$393 billion, as the House Democrat budget does. It directs conferees to commit to two things: Number one, reject the massive tax increase in the House budget that increases marginal tax rates, reimposes the marriage penalty, reimposes the death tax, cuts the child credit in half, and raises a range of other taxes as well.

And, number two, stop the raid on Social Security cash surpluses. Conferees should produce a budget with a surplus sufficient to halt the raid on cash surpluses in the Social Security trust funds by fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Speaker, these challenges aren't going to go away, and delaying addressing them just makes them worse and burdens future generations. The Republican alternative offers solutions, and for this reason I urge my colleagues to support the Republican motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's not surprising to me why there is such disorientation from the erstwhile majority about the budget resolution that will be going to conference. It's because it contains a

principle that they don't understand, which is called deficit reduction.

The erstwhile majority made a living out of borrowing money, spending more, taxing less, borrowing more; spending more, taxing less, borrowing more. They turned a huge projected budget surplus into an immense budget deficit and debt, which will be paid for by the children and grandchildren of the Members of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts about the budget resolution the House passed: The fact is not one dollar of taxes is raised on anyone in the fiscal year covered by the first year of this resolution or the second year. Now, we get to a point at the end of 2009 where the tax cuts which the erstwhile majority enacted a few years ago expire. They passed a law that said that those tax cuts expire. We say let's pause at that point and decide what is in the best interest of the country. And there are options. Perhaps the surplus will have grown to the point where we can finance all of those tax cuts and not increase the deficit. Perhaps there will be greater revenues that have been projected under our conservative revenue estimates and we will be able to afford to extend all the tax cuts. Perhaps we will look at the state of the economy at that time and decide that the best thing to do is to extend all the tax cuts to try to engender some economic growth. Or perhaps we will decide that a rigid discipline that emphasizes deficit reduction, as is in this resolution, is the right thing to do.

The erstwhile majority practiced the principle of leap first and look later. This resolution says look before you leap. It says when we reach the point where the tax cuts expire, we will make a judgment about whether spending cuts, tax cut renewal, or some other strategy is in the best interest of the country.

Not one dollar of taxes is raised in the first fiscal year covered by this budget, and nothing in this resolution necessitates the raising of any taxes on anyone. It simply says, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should do something the erstwhile majority never did: Look before you leap. Make decisions based on good economic evidence, not blind faith.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to my articulate friend from New Jersey, I think what he mentioned was a real good highlight on the philosophical differences between our two parties. The question is, who is first in line, the taxpayer or the government? We believe that the taxpayer ought to be first in line by keeping more of their hard-earned money, not the government. The State of New Jersey, which is a high tax-paying State, on average under these tax increases will pay an average of \$3,780 more under Democrat-passed budget per taxpayer in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the terms of the gentleman from New Jersey speaking about not leaping first. It's kind of a very aesthetic way to say to it. No, what he's taking about is leaping on the American taxpayer. That's what the Democratic budget does. It does leap on the American taxpayer because it does increase \$392 billion on the American taxpayer. This budget does. And all Americans are going to be paying for this. Middle-income families, low-income earners, families with children, and small businesses.

And we have heard again that they don't want to raise taxes in this budget. But if that's true, Mr. Speaker, then let's instruct the conferees to extend these popular tax provisions, these tax relief provisions.

Unfortunately, at the committee markup, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans offered several amendments to do just that, aimed at helping the hardworking American taxpayers. Not one single Democrat voted in favor of these commonsense tax cut provisions. And what were they, Mr. Speaker? Because they always like to say, oh, it's tax cuts for the rich. No. Let's talk about what they are, what they voted against in committee, without one dissenting vote.

They voted against extending the \$1,000 per child tax credit. Not only the wealthy have kids in this country, Mr. Speaker. They voted against extending the marriage penalty tax relief. Not only the wealthy get married, at least not in the State of Florida that I represent. They voted against elimination of the death tax. That's right. They want dead people to pay more taxes. And they voted against extending the State and local tax deduction.

How does this affect regular middle-class Americans? Mr. Speaker, a middle-income family of four earning \$60,000 will look at over a 60 percent tax increase by the year 2011. One hundred and fifteen million taxpayers will see their taxes increase an average of \$1,700 by 2011. In Florida that I am privileged to represent, over 6.7 million taxpayers will see their taxes increase increased by over \$3,000.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

It is an interesting debate that is going on here today because in terms of the motion to instruct, there really isn't that great a difference of opinion. We are, in fact, going to be able to meet the objectives. We are working hard in our budget to make sure that we deal meaningfully with tax relief for those who need it.

The difference between the Republicans and the Democrats is that they are not willing to make any distinction. For them it is Paris Hilton who is first in line. We have made it clear that we are going to work to make sure that

real priorities for American families are adopted. We have proven that in terms of what we have stood for in the past as well as what we are working for in the future.

Democrats have repeatedly voted for a lowered tax bracket on lower-income people, the expansion of the earned income tax credit, marriage penalty relief, increase in the child tax credit, acceleration of the expansion of the 10-percent bracket, increased expensing for small businesses. These were things that people here on the floor who are on our side of the aisle offered up as a responsible alternative when our friends on the other side were engaged in a rather extensive and unfocused effort to try to provide tax benefits for those who need them the least while ignoring the needs of those who need it the most.

They have given some modest bones to a few in America. Those that merit our support will, in fact, be continued. And, more important, we are going to deal with what is the largest tax increase in American history, which the Bush administration and my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle have set the stage for, and that is the tsunami of the alternative minimum tax. That is going to cost \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, and we have made it clear that that is our number one priority to solve, as in the House Committee on Ways and Means we working on this.

We don't have to accede to every single detail for Paris Hilton in order to make sure that we deal with the needs of working Americans and the tax tsunami of the alternative minimum tax, which has been ignored session after session after session by the Republicans when they were in charge.

I find no small amount of irony to hear my good friend from Wisconsin talking about how he has proven it is possible to have a unified budget surplus when for 12 consecutive years of ironclad Republican control they wrote all the fiscal rules, wrote the budgets, wrote the tax policy.

□ 1430

I invite anybody to look at what the now minority proved that they could do. It's a pretty sorry record of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, my point is simply that the budget resolution that we brought forward is a reasonable, meaningful approach to deal with these fiscal problems.

Independent observers agree that there is no tax increase this year or the next. And we are on a path allowed for in our budget resolution and the work we are doing in the Ways and Means Committee right now to make sure that we solve the tax tsunami of the alternative minimum tax.

I look forward to our getting past this type of discussion here, as my friends on the other side of the aisle seek to substitute rhetoric for their sorry record of non-accomplishment, and look forward to moving forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HENSARLING from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have listened very carefully to the previous speaker talk about rhetoric. And indeed, the rhetoric I hear from the other side of the aisle is pure Orwellian; up is down, black is white, victory is defeat and the largest tax increase in American history is somehow actually tax relief.

You cannot state good intentions and then instead act with cruel actions. The numbers of this budget lead to the largest single tax increase in American history. And Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the Washington Post again, not exactly a bastion of conservative thought, I will quote from their March 29th edition, "And while House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all these cuts expire on schedule in 2010." And then they somehow say that we contrive temporary tax relief. Well, as the chairman knows, he has had plenty of opportunities to make this tax relief permanent, but he and everyone else on that side of the aisle have declined that opportunity.

And again, it's a matter of priorities. Democrat friends decide to prioritize the Federal budget over the family budget. But let's look at how their single largest tax increase in American history is going to impact family budgets. Let's hear from Joan from Mesquite, who wrote, "An additional \$2,200 raise in taxes for my husband and me would mean that we would not be able to meet our budget obligations. I drive an 11-year-old car. And sometimes it breaks. And it costs me more to fix than what it's worth. I was hoping to buy a newer car, but if taxes go up, I won't be able to do that."

Let's hear from Robert of Garland. "I'm unemployed on Social Security and my wife works. At this point, between taxes and utilities, we're at the breaking point of being able to keep our home. If we have an increase of over \$2,000 per year, it may well mean the straw that broke the camel's back; we would lose our home." That's how the single largest tax increase in American history is affecting that family.

Let's see how it affects Linda in Rowlett. "It would mean the difference of whether my daughter or husband would be able to purchase a car or not. For my husband and I, it helps us continue with his radiation treatments for his prostate cancer and allows us to continue providing in-home assistance for my elderly parents. Please allow us to retain this money for our needs. Please don't let government take additional tax dollars from us."

That's the cruel actions. It's not the Orwellian rhetoric that we want to somehow preserve the tax relief. They are imposing the single largest tax in-

crease in American history, a cruel hoax on American families as they try to meet their education budgets and their transportation budgets.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on either side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 17½ minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it's important to put up a chart so we will know who's saying what about fiscal responsibility, because this chart shows what happened in the nineties when, with President Clinton's veto vetoing Republican bills after the Democrats set the budget off in the right direction, we were able to create a surplus that when this administration came in in 2001, we had a projected \$5.5 trillion surplus. As a result of Republican initiatives, that surplus looks like it's going to come in, a 10-year surplus, at about a \$3 trillion deficit, a swing of \$8.5 trillion. And to put that in perspective, we've spent about \$500 billion in Iraq; \$8.5 trillion deterioration of the budget, \$500 billion in Iraq, that is \$0.5 trillion; \$8.5 trillion deterioration, \$0.5 trillion attributable to the war. And the Democratic budget, again, responsibly digs us out of this mess.

The important thing to note is, we talk about 9/11. We were broke. We spent the surplus, other than Social Security and Medicare, before 9/11. So you can't blame 9/11 for the fiscal decline that has happened here.

This budget is responsible. It shows how we can dig ourselves out. Unfortunately, we have, first of all, no leadership from the White House. Even the Republican budget pretty much ignores the President's budget. The President's budget had us in a ditch, never coming into surplus. At least the Republican budget has us coming out of the deficit and into surplus in 2012, but it does it in such a way that is not responsible and not predictable.

The Republicans' budget assumes that we're going to whack about \$250 billion out of Medicare and Medicaid, about \$250 billion cut out of health care. This is at a time when doctors are telling us now that they can't absorb the cuts. We are having situations now when States are not paying dentists enough for dentists to even take Medicaid. \$250 billion cut. It's not going to happen. We're not going to go into surplus under the Republican budget.

The main factor that we have to look at is, who's talking? The Democrats dug us out of the ditch; Republicans put us back in the ditch; and the Democrats are digging us out again with a responsible budget. The Republicans have a budget that is so draconian on health care that 40 Republicans even voted against the Republican budget.

And so we have a responsible plan. Let's stick with the responsible plan, dig us out of the mess again, and have fiscal responsibility.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, despite the hopes of the other side of the aisle, the constituents in my district are pretty smart people. When they were paying a little over \$2 a gallon for gasoline a year or so ago and now they're paying upwards of \$3 per gallon, they know that's an increase out of their pocket. Likewise, when it comes to taxes, when they see that they are paying so much for their taxes now on the Federal level now, and after this package goes through on the other side of the aisle, they will be paying upwards to \$3,000 or more. They know, they're smart enough to realize that's a tax increase as well.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have to look to outside non-partisan groups they call them, really nonpartisan liberal think tanks I think is the best term, for those think tanks to say that these are not tax increases when they really are. When your taxes go up from this year to the next year to the next year, that is a tax increase.

They talk about the budget planning process and say, don't worry, it only comes at the end of the budget. Well, you know, regular families plan during the entire budget. If you have a weekly budget for your food allotment, you want to make sure you have food at the end of the week. If you're doing a monthly budget, you plan the entire month. If you have a yearly budget or a 5-year budget as this is, you do it in the entire 5 years. And under the Democrats' budget, your taxes during the course of that time will go up. In New Jersey, you're looking at a \$3,000 or more tax increase.

When it comes to Social Security, my constituents are also very smart and loud when they say, "Keep your hands off of my Social Security." The Republican plan does that. The Republican plan stops the raid on Social Security, and it does so without a tax increase.

Now, there is some rumor I am hearing by some Democrats on the other side of the aisle that they may support our motion to recommit. But mind you, mark my words, if they support this motion to recommit, it will be as disingenuous as their support and their comments and other things they have done in the past this year. When they said that they were going to curtail spending, what did they actually do? They increased spending by over 11 percent in this budget. When they said they weren't going to raise your taxes, what did they do? They increased your taxes by \$392 billion. And when they said that they were going to solve the AMT problem, what did they do? They did not solve it at all.

Support this motion to recommit.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the last speaker, if we support this resolution, it's because we originally provided in our budget resolution, in two different aspects of our budget resolution, our full, wholehearted support for these middle-income tax cuts. We still have, I will have to confess, concern about your arithmetic here, but we supported it in the budget resolution we filed, which passed the House. We endorsed and pledged that we would seek to the extension of the 10 percent individual tax bracket, the child tax credit, research and experimentation tax credit, all of these things. Read the resolution. They're there. We were there before you were, saying that, over the next 3 or 4 years, we need to see that when December 31, 2010, comes along, these tax cuts will survive and be preserved. We are committed to that, black and white print, budget resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I will yield for one question.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Because you referred to my comments.

When you said that you planned this in the budget, are your comments referring to reserve accounts?

Mr. SPRATT. No. I'm talking about statements in our budget resolution which state emphatically and clearly, "It is the policy of this budget resolution to preserve, defend and protect the middle-income tax cuts adopted in 2001 and 2003, which will expire in 2010."

Now, we do believe, and this also is in our budget resolution, we believe in the PAYGO principle. We believe that the Tax Code is full of deductions and credits and exemptions and exclusions, and you can go through a closet cleaning in the Code and come up with enough offsets to provide for the extension of many of these tax cuts, maybe not all but many, without any adverse impact on the bottom line budget deficit.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SPRATT. I will yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I understand what you're saying, the first part, that those are the heart-felt policy statements of your budget. But are you referring then to the other side of the equation, to the reserve accounts that are spoken of in the budget as far as, I will use the term, for paying for those?

Mr. SPRATT. There was a provision that allowed for reserve accounts so that we could provide for these tax cuts. But basically we took the position that this decision does not have to be made now, and indeed it can be better made closer in time to December 31, when we see what is the bottom line then. How much debt have we accumulated? What is the total deficit? What is the forecast for the future? At that point in time, we can consider the tax cuts, extension of them.

By my understanding, if you extend all of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that expire on December 31, the cost over 10 years is about \$2 trillion. That's a big decision. We think you should make it deliberately and closer in point of time to when these tax cuts actually expire.

Let me say also that not only did we put these tax cuts and state our support for them in the budget resolution, but in addition, when the tax cuts were passed in 2001, we either had substitutes or occasionally voted for independent free-standing provisions like the marriage penalty relief. Democrats were there when that passed the House. I voted for it the first time it came up and voted for it again repeatedly. In our substitutes, we had a 12 percent bracket and then a 10 percent bracket. We had a child tax credit, which we continually increase, and we had the R&E tax credit extension. We had expensing for small businesses. Many, if not all, of the things you are talking about here we voted for, maybe not on your bills but on our bills because these are tax policies favoring middle-income Americans for whom we think tax relief is well in order.

Secondly, we have a problem still with the arithmetic that you've got here.

□ 1445

According to my information, looking at CBO's most recent report, the Social Security surplus for 2012 is \$255 billion. If you want to stay out of Social Security, you have got to have a surplus of at least \$255 billion, a unified surplus of at least \$255 billion, am I correct?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the \$96 billion unified surplus reflects the cash surplus, meaning the amount of overpayments on FICA taxes, payroll taxes for Social Security, that gets spent on other government programs that ought to go to Social Security. The interest on top of that is the number that the gentleman from South Carolina is talking about. That reflects past borrowing, past raiding of the Social Security surplus. We would like to fix that, too.

We think that is a good start. Let's say from now on if you pay FICA taxes to Social Security, let's not spend it on all these other government programs. So the cash surplus that occurs in 2012, that is what we are talking about with that \$96 billion, not the interest on top that reflects all of the past borrowing and raiding of the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I understand that. But the Social Security surplus is \$255 billion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is the cash surplus, plus interest. We are talking about the cash surplus.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, if you look at the surplus you are claiming, \$96 billion, and also provide for these tax cuts, my information is that these tax cuts have a revenue impact of at least \$180 billion.

That would mean in the year 2012 there has to be a bottom line surplus of \$276 billion before the tax cuts are taken.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that is not all in the year 2012, I believe. There is a problem with the numbers here.

Mr. SPRATT. \$180 billion I believe is 1 year.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We seem to have a difference of opinion. But let me make one point: We showed you how to do it.

Mr. SPRATT. But you haven't shown us the arithmetic. We are not sure your arithmetic is correct.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We showed you with our budget substitute, we do not raise taxes on the American economy and family, and we can also stop raiding the cash surplus of Social Security. And the reason I can tell you we showed you is that is exactly what the Republican budget resolution substitute did, as scored by CBO.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes to make a couple of comments before I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I think I made the point on the Social Security cash surplus. We are talking about how much overpayments people pay in their payroll taxes in any given year. We don't want to keep spending that on other government programs. That is point number one.

Point number two: The very fact that the gentleman from South Carolina is suggesting that they are going to accept this motion to instruct, that they are going to accept this, means they agree there are tax increases in this budget.

They are saying right now, I just heard him say it, we don't want to raise taxes on the middle-class. We don't want to get rid of the child tax credit. We don't want to bring back the marriage penalty. We don't want to do away with the 10 percent bracket. So we will accept this motion to instruct. I.e., the other tax increases in this budget are just that, tax increases. Death tax, the marginal income tax rates across-the-board, capital gains, dividends.

Let me just make the point more clearly, by not quoting a think tank that may be left of center, right of center, whatever of center. Let me quote the Washington Post, clearly no paragon of right-wing thinking.

The Washington Post, right after the Democrat budget came out: "And while House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all of these tax cuts expire on schedule in 2010."

They further go on to say about the Democratic budget plan, "The budget plan expresses support for certain cuts, including the extended child tax credit, elimination of the marriage penalty, and the 10 percent bracket, that would

require another reserve fund to be filled with hundreds of billions of dollars in tax increases to cover the cost."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the House Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I think to the other Members in the House listening to this debate this sounds like a school yard kind of struggle: Yes, you are; no, you're not; yes, you are; no, you're not. We are back and forth. We are both using the same set of facts.

But the truth of the matter is, in 2011 and 2012, however it happens, under the current code the revenues of the government will go up \$400 billion. The rhetoric on the other side of the aisle that this does not represent a tax increase would have a lot greater credibility with me and those on our side of the aisle if in fact our colleagues on the Budget Committee hadn't spent that \$400 billion.

The chairman mentioned earlier about waiting until December 31, 2011, to fix these things. The problem with that is that at the end of 2010, maybe that is the date he was referencing, the estate tax goes from a zero tax rate to a 55 percent tax rate.

I spent a career helping folks comply with a very complex code, and estate planning requires generally a lot longer period of time to react and put plans in place than from one year to the next. So, to keep estates out there hung up with the idea that the tax is going to come back fully at 55 percent, I think is unfair.

The other thing that has to be said is that all of the tax increases go in fully. So the 33 percent bracket goes to a 39.6 percent bracket. In fact the Democrats do want to protect the 10 percent bracket from going to 15 percent, as they have said, they are going to have to raise taxes on the top brackets. They are going to have to raise taxes in other places in order to stay within this bill's definition of PAYGO.

So I am going to speak in favor of the motion to instruct, but just for full and fair disclosure, I voted twice, since we did vote on this bill twice, against the Democrats' budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

One additional point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is the point about PAYGO that the gentleman from South Carolina mentioned. As it is well known, we have a problem with their version of PAYGO. When PAYGO is designed to raise taxes, we don't like it. When PAYGO is designed to control spending, we like it. That is why we are for PAYGO on spending, not on raising taxes.

But if this amendment is accepted, if this motion to instruct is accepted, let's just be very clear, it does violate their PAYGO. Because the Baucus amendment, which is what we are referring to, which is the amendment

that passed in the Senate, uses their surpluses, quote-unquote, to pay for these tax cuts. PAYGO says if you are going to reduce taxes, you have to offset them with either a tax increase or a spending cut, not with surpluses.

So this amendment, we believe if you are going to have a surplus, it should either go back to the Social Security trust fund and pay down debt, or reduce taxes. That is what we are proposing.

But just so we are very clear with ourselves here, this Baucus amendment, this acceptance of this policy of not raising all of these taxes, just some of them, which is the best choice we have between the two options as the minority, does violate their own PAYGO rule by dedicating their surpluses towards this tax relief, rather than having offsets, either coming from spending cuts or tax increases.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, PAYGO is a very simple concept. If you are going to increase spending, you pay for it. If you are going to cut taxes, you pay for it. You don't go into the ditch. If you have a tax cut, you have to pay for it either with increases of other taxes or spending cuts to pay for it. If you have spending increases, you have to pay for it with cutting spending somewhere else or increasing taxes to pay for it. It is a very simple concept.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If you are going to reduce taxes, you have to pay for it by either raising taxes or cutting spending. That is what your PAYGO is, correct?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Well, you are violating it if you accept this amendment then.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. That is the concept, and that is how we got out of the ditch that we got into. If you build up a surplus, then you have something to spend. That is consistent with PAYGO.

But the point is that we got out of the ditch with fiscal responsibility, and as soon as 2001 came along, you let PAYGO expire, passed tax cuts that we couldn't afford and put us right back into the ditch. The fact is that the only way the Republican budget makes any sense is if you have \$250 billion in cuts, mostly in Medicare and Medicaid, at a time when we can't even afford the cuts that are already in effect.

To put that \$250 billion in context, there are plans out there, including the All Healthy Children Act, which can cover all children with healthcare for \$15 billion a year. You are talking about cutting healthcare \$250 billion. Obviously, you are not going to do it and so obviously the budget is not realistic.

But what are your priorities? Tax cuts that we can't afford at a time when we need to cover children? We can't even afford the Medicaid program we have got now. In most States, you can't find a dentist because the reimbursement rates aren't high enough, and here we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid \$250 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would adopt the Democratic budget and reject the motion to recommit, because it requires us to assume \$250 billion in cuts that we are not going to make. We have a responsible budget. It digs us out of the ditch that the Republicans put us in starting in 2001.

I would hope again we would reject the motion and adopt the Democratic budget as we passed it in the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to my friend from Virginia. The only thing that is being cut here is the family budget, and it is being cut by the Democrats. If you look at the numbers of the Republican budget, government grows each and every year. Now, it doesn't grow as fast as the Democrat budget. And the way the Democrat budget grows is by imposing the single largest tax increase in American history on hard-working Americans.

An average in my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, an average of \$2,700 a year, Mr. Speaker, is going to be imposed on those hard-working people as they try to send their children to college, as they struggle to try to meet the healthcare payments for elderly parents, as they try to make payments on their healthcare premiums, as they try to put together that capital to launch their American dream and to buy their first home.

The cutting that is going on here is the cutting out of the heart of the family budget by the Democrat budget, imposing the single largest tax increase in American history. And as bad as that tax increase is, \$392 billion over 5 years, it is a pittance compared to the taxes that they are going to impose on the next generation, because, Mr. Speaker, their budget is silent, absolutely silent, on the number one fiscal challenge facing America, out-of-control entitlement spending.

The Republicans are being responsible in trying to ensure that the next generation doesn't see a doubling of their taxes, which we all know will happen.

So this is the kick-the-can-down-the-road budget of the Democrats, when they know that our children and grandchildren will see their taxes doubled from roughly 20 percent of the economy to 40 percent. Now, how many of our children and grandchildren will ever be able to own a home, start a business or send their children to college?

This is the idea of the Democrats' fiscal responsibility, doubling taxes on

the American people? I want no part of it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that when you talk about average tax cuts, this is an average \$250 a family tax cut, average \$250 for a family of four. But you notice who gets it? This is involving personal exemptions and standard deductions.

If you make a \$1 million, \$17,000; \$650 if you make \$200,000 to \$1 million; \$11 if you make \$100,000 to \$200,000; if you make less than \$100,000, you get on average of zero.

This is what you call an average \$250 a family tax cut.

□ 1500

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have here a copy of the President's budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2008 published by the Congressional Budget Office. If you turn to page 6, you will see that the cost of the tax cuts, extending the tax cuts, which the motion proposes, the cost or the revenue impact of that in the year 2012 is \$231 billion. That is what CBO says.

If you now add \$96 billion to that, the surplus that year must be \$327 billion. The surplus, \$327 billion. Last year the deficit was \$248 billion. If we move to a surplus of \$327 billion in the year 2012, that requires a movement in the right direction of \$575 billion which is hard to believe.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I wish we were talking about all of the tax cuts. Unfortunately, what we have in the Baucus amendment, that is only \$132 billion in 2012 because the Baucus amendment only extends some of the tax cuts.

The point we are making is, if we want to stop raising taxes and raiding Social Security, we are going to have to control spending. That is what we propose to do; and sadly, that is not what the majority budget does.

Mr. SPRATT. The point, I am sure, is you are supportive of all of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. You are limited by procedural rules to only dealing with that which is in the scope of the two resolutions. But, in fact, I am sure you are supportive of that. If that is true, you have to acknowledge that the number is \$231 billion. That is the revenue impact of extending all of the tax cuts. If you add 96, which is the surplus you project, you get a big, big number.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a member of the House Budget Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to all of

this debate, and I guess what I don't really understand is, why? I mean, why the Democrats here on the other side of the aisle want to oppose this motion to instruct.

I mean, do you want to raid the Social Security surplus? Do you like telling people that they are paying money for their own Social Security and retirement and then taking it and using it for other things? Do you like that? Do you want to do that? I mean, do you want to enact the biggest tax increase in American history? Do you want really to tax people more on capital gains and dividends when over 50 percent of Americans now own some sort of stock? Do you want to go back to penalizing married couples and having them pay more taxes after they get married than two people would when they were single? Do you really want to reduce the child care tax credit? Do you want to stifle economic growth?

I know some of you say you don't think that these tax cuts caused this economic growth. Let's assume they didn't cause it all. It can't be a coincidence that since the tax reductions went into place, we have had enormous economic growth, enormous job growth and enormous revenue growth to the Federal Government.

Do you really want to do all that? Do you really want to pass the largest tax increase in American history; and for what? So you can raise spending a lot over the next 5 years because if you just didn't increase spending, you could do all of this. You could allow Americans to keep their own money.

But no, you want to take their money from them and spend it on your priorities. Now I guess that is what you want to do. I still don't understand it. I don't understand why the government having money is so much more a priority, but I guess it is because you look at all money as the government's, and you allow people to keep some. We look at money as belonging to the people who earned it, and we allow the government to take that which is necessary.

But understand that if all you did was keep spending level or increase it a little bit over the next 5 years, then you wouldn't have to raise taxes and then you wouldn't have to raid the Social Security surplus. But apparently that is what you want to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes. Mr. Speaker, this goes back to something that our President called fuzzy math. And if I seem hung up on the topic of math, it is because arithmetic is important when you are putting together a budget.

What they are telling us is they can run a \$96 billion surplus in the year 2012 even though they are taking tax cuts that will take \$231 billion in revenues out of the Federal Treasury. It is a stretch, to say the least. That involves assuming that we will have a surplus in the year 2012 of \$327 billion.

How far from that are we today? Last year we had a deficit of \$248 billion. If

we are to move to a surplus of \$327 billion by the year 2012, there has to be a movement in the right direction, a positive movement of \$575 billion. Let's hope it happens, but I wouldn't bet the farm on it.

They then say and just said we are raiding Social Security. How absurd can you get? Here it is right here. The Social Security surplus is \$255 billion. They do not even claim more than \$96 billion on the surplus. If they left the tax cut out, they would indeed have enough bottom line, 96 plus 231, to cover the surplus, but they haven't done that.

Here on the bottom line, the back of an envelope, is a simple chart that I bring down to the well with me every time I talk because we need to be reminded. When President Bush came to office, the national debt was \$5.7 trillion. Six years later, the national debt is \$8.8 trillion, an increase of \$3.1 trillion over the last 6 years. That is a 60 percent increase in the debt of the United States. We have not seen anything like it since the Second World War.

Are we worried about fuzzy math? You better believe we are because this is the consequence of it. What the Republican budget resolution would have done had it been adopted is it would have extended again and again the policy of borrow and spend, leaving the tab to our children.

Here is what the tab looked like, in addition to the \$8.8 trillion: You can cut taxes today, but what you leave in the wake of what you have done is a debt tax, the one tax that has to be paid because it is the amount of money we have to levy and raise every year to pay interest on our national debt, which is obligatory. It cannot be avoided. It has to be paid.

Here is the difference between interest on the national debt, which is well over \$200 billion, headed to \$300 billion within the foreseeable future, and look what it does to other priorities, things that are pressing and important like veterans health care, homeland security, and education. All of those things are dwarfed by the increase in interest payments on the debt.

This is a debt tax we have to pay today. All Americans have to pay it. Our children will have to pay it because of our irresponsible fiscal policy. This is why we need to clear up this fuzzy math and put the country back on a firm path to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great concern for our economy. I rise because we hear about the debt and certainly my concern is that if we are not careful, we will make the debt even worse than it is now because an economy can turn south with overtaxation. Right now we are headed to tax increases that concern me a great deal.

In Nebraska, the average tax increase per taxpayer is almost \$2,400 a year as

proposed. More than that though, I am concerned about small businesses, farmers and ranchers who face tax increases whether it is the estate tax or other taxes.

When I have a small business person come up to me and say, we need to do something about the estate tax, the death tax because it will devastate their business, that gets my attention.

My concerns are that we have available capital in our economy because, with available capital, we see good things happening, whether it is investing in the stock market or whether it is expanding a small business or whether it is putting money away for a child or grandchild heading to college. The fact is, available capital does great things, and that is why I rise with extreme concern about our budget because the budget calls for a tax increase, and that is what concerns me so much because tax increases are bad for economic growth. Tax increases lead to a downturn in the economy.

I not only believe we can do better than this proposed budget, but we must do better.

Mr. SPRATT. For the clarification of Members, let me give you my take on what is before us right now. This motion to instruct conferees calls for us to recede, back off the revenue levels in the House amendment and insist on, listen to this, policy statement in section 401 of the House amendment. That is our budget resolution, the Democratic budget resolution.

It is the place in our resolution where one time we have insisted, pledged our support for the extension of these middle-income tax cuts passed in 2001 and 2003. That is paragraph A. It is hard for us to disagree with the enforcement of the language that we put in the budget resolution in the first place.

Secondly, paragraph B, insist on the lowest possible levels of revenue within the scope of the conference.

It is hard to tell what that level might be, whether or not it is consistent with the one above, but we certainly will give some consideration to that.

And finally, set forth a unified surplus of at least \$96 billion in fiscal year 2012. I hope we can do it, but you have heard me go through the arithmetic out here, and I think it is a reach to even imply that these three variables can be integrated and solved in this one multi varied equation.

If you can do it, fine. If you can come out of all this still having these tax cuts and still having a \$96 billion surplus, great. But I have to tell you, I think it is fuzzy math.

But we are wholeheartedly in support of the middle-income tax cuts that are enumerated here. Indeed, they have been lifted straight out of the Democratic budget resolution, and that is why we are supportive of them.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me concur that the resolution does say what the chairman

says it does. The reason it points to the words in the House budget resolution, which say that the policy of the House is to keep these tax cuts, but we refer to the deeds of the Senate is because the House didn't pay for those tax cuts, didn't extend those tax cuts. The Senate extended those tax cuts.

The House used the words that said, we hope, we wish, we would like to extend these tax cuts, but they didn't do that. They raised the taxes. It is the Senate.

The mere fact that the Senate passed the Baucus amendment in the first place is a repudiation of the claim by the House that they are actually not raising taxes.

The Senate looked at the House budget resolution and said, you know what, this thing is the largest tax increase in American history. We don't want to raise taxes on middle-income earners, child tax credit, marriage penalty, 10 percent bracket; and therefore, they passed the Baucus amendment.

What we are saying is we wish we could extend all of the tax cuts. Since the scope is limited, we are saying, let's stick with the Senate and actually put numbers where the words are in the House by actually lowering the revenue number.

Now, the chairman is right. He is saying it is a reach to reach these surpluses. It is too tough to do it to reach these surpluses if you accept his premise. And the premise of the chairman's budget is do nothing to control spending.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have a revenue problem in Washington. Just the last 7 months alone we had 11 percent revenue growth. That is 3 straight years of double-digit revenue growth at these lower tax rates. We have plenty of money coming in from taxpayers. The problem is we are spending it too fast. That is the problem in Washington, not a revenue problem, a spending problem.

If you accept the premise of the chairman, the esteemed gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), that there is no spending problem in Washington, which I don't accept, then he is correct, you can't balance the budget. You can't stop the raid on Social Security and you can't extend tax relief.

□ 1515

We disagree. How tough is it to do it? Let me tell you what our budget accomplished, the Republican substitute. We simply said in order to stop the raid of the Social Security surplus and make all these tax cuts permanent, spend \$14.977 trillion over the next 7 years instead of the current projection, \$15.286 trillion. That is what we are saying. We are saying instead of spending over the next 5 years \$15.286 trillion, spend \$14.977 trillion. Instead of growing mandatory spending by 5.2 percent, grow it at 4.3 percent.

Is this Draconian, is this crazy, is this hard core? No. It's what families do around a kitchen table every day.

We are simply saying put taxpayers first. Don't make people wait for 3 years to see if they're going to have their per-child tax credit, if they're going to have the marriage penalty, if the estate taxes are going to be higher, lower or somewhere in between. Tell them now. Let's tell taxpayers, first you get to keep your money; then we're going to tighten our belt here in Washington by controlling spending.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers deserve this respect. They don't deserve to be jerked around. We should control spending, and by golly, we need to prepare for the retirement of these baby boomers. We need to reform these entitlement programs so we can extend their solvency, extend their reliability, and that is the biggest shame of all.

Not only does this budget have the largest tax increase in American history; it proposes that we do nothing for the next 5 years to control and reform entitlements to do anything to control spending. That's a shame. That's why we should pass this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. ANDREWS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT E. ANDREWS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court of New Jersey, Gloucester County.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. ANDREWS,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF THE HONORABLE DAVID PRICE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Rose Auman, District Director, Office of the Honorable DAVID PRICE, Member of Congress:

MAY 4, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a judicial subpoena for trial testimony issued by the Orange County, North Carolina District Court.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

ROSE AUMAN,
District Director.

THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 377, I call up the bill (H.R. 1294) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1294

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2006”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 101. Findings.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Federal recognition.
Sec. 104. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 105. Governing body.
Sec. 106. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 107. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

Sec. 201. Findings.
Sec. 202. Definitions.
Sec. 203. Federal recognition.
Sec. 204. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 205. Governing body.
Sec. 206. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 207. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

Sec. 301. Findings.
Sec. 302. Definitions.
Sec. 303. Federal recognition.
Sec. 304. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 305. Governing body.
Sec. 306. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 307. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

Sec. 401. Findings.
Sec. 402. Definitions.
Sec. 403. Federal recognition.
Sec. 404. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 405. Governing body.
Sec. 406. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 407. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Sec. 501. Findings.
Sec. 502. Definitions.
Sec. 503. Federal recognition.
Sec. 504. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 505. Governing body.
Sec. 506. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 507. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 601. Findings.
Sec. 602. Definitions.
Sec. 603. Federal recognition.
Sec. 604. Membership; governing documents.
Sec. 605. Governing body.
Sec. 606. Reservation of the Tribe.
Sec. 607. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York Mattaponi River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(12) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(13) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(14) in 1919, C. Lee Moore, Auditor of Public Accounts for Virginia, told Chickahominy Chief O.W. Adkins that he had instructed the Commissioner of Revenue for Charles City County to record Chickahominy tribal members on the county tax rolls as Indian, and not as white or colored;

(15) during the period of 1920 through 1930, various Governors of the Commonwealth of Virginia wrote letters of introduction for Chickahominy Chiefs who had official business with Federal agencies in Washington, DC;

(16) in 1934, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, requesting money to acquire land for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe's use, to build school, medical, and library facilities and to buy tractors, implements, and seed;

(17) in 1934, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, wrote to Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins, informing him that Congress had passed the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the "Indian Reorganization Act") (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), but had not made the appropriation to fund the Act;

(18) in 1942, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for help in getting the proper racial designation on Selective Service records for Chickahominy soldiers;

(19) in 1943, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asked Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News-Leader newspaper of Richmond, Virginia, to help Virginia Indians obtain proper racial designation on birth records;

(20) Collier stated that his office could not officially intervene because it had no responsibility for the Virginia Indians, "as a matter largely of historical accident", but was "interested in them as descendants of the original inhabitants of the region";

(21) in 1948, the Veterans' Education Committee of the Virginia State Board of Education approved Samaria Indian School to provide training to veterans;

(22) that school was established and run by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe;

(23) in 1950, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe purchased and donated to the Charles City County School Board land to be used to build a modern school for students of the Chickahominy and other Virginia Indian tribes;

(24) the Samaria Indian School included students in grades 1 through 8;

(25) In 1961, Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, requested Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins to provide assistance in analyzing the status of the constitutional rights of Indians "in your area";

(26) in 1967, the Charles City County school board closed Samaria Indian School and converted the school to a countywide primary school as a step toward full school integration of Indian and non-Indian students;

(27) in 1972, the Charles City County school board began receiving funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) on behalf of Chickahominy students, which funding is provided as of the date of enactment of this Act under title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aaa et seq.);

(28) in 1974, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe bought land and built a tribal center using monthly pledges from tribal members to finance the transactions;

(29) in 1983, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was granted recognition as an Indian tribe by the Commonwealth of Virginia, along with 5 other Indian tribes; and

(30) in 1985, Governor Gerald Baliles was the special guest at an intertribal Thanksgiving Day dinner hosted by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **TRIBAL MEMBER.**—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term "Tribe" means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) **FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) **FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 104. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 106. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers to the Secretary land within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) **GAMING.**—

(1) **GAMING.**—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) **APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.**—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 107. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1870, a census revealed an enclave of Indians in New Kent County that is believed to be the beginning of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(12) other records were destroyed when the New Kent County courthouse was burned, leaving a State census as the only record covering that period;

(13) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(14) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(15) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(16) in 1910, a 1-room school covering grades 1 through 8 was established in New Kent County for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(17) during the period of 1920 through 1921, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division began forming a tribal government;

(18) E.P. Bradby, the founder of the Tribe, was elected to be Chief;

(19) in 1922, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church was organized;

(20) in 1925, a certificate of incorporation was issued to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(21) in 1950, the 1-room Indian school in New Kent County was closed and students were bused to Samaria Indian School in Charles City County;

(22) in 1967, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe and the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division lost their schools as a result of the required integration of students;

(23) during the period of 1982 through 1984, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church built a new sanctuary to accommodate church growth;

(24) in 1983 the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted State recognition along with 5 other Virginia Indian tribes;

(25) in 1985—

(A) the Virginia Council on Indians was organized as a State agency; and

(B) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted a seat on the Council;

(26) in 1988, a nonprofit organization known as the “United Indians of Virginia” was formed; and

(27) Chief Marvin “Strongoak” Bradby of the Eastern Band of the Chickahominy presently chairs the organization.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all future services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 204. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 206. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers to the Secretary any land within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—

(1) GAMING.—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 207. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the period of 1607 through 1646, the Chickahominy Indian Tribes—

(A) lived approximately 20 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) Mattaponi Indians, who later joined the Chickahominy Indians, lived a greater distance from Jamestown;

(3) in 1646, the Chickahominy Indians moved to Mattaponi River basin, away from the English;

(4) in 1661, the Chickahominy Indians sold land at a place known as “the cliffs” on the Mattaponi River;

(5) in 1669, the Chickahominy Indians—

(A) appeared in the Virginia Colony’s census of Indian bowmen; and

(B) lived in “New Kent” County, which included the Mattaponi River basin at that time;

(6) in 1677, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians were subjects of the Queen of Pamunkey, who was a signatory to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1683, after a Mattaponi town was attacked by Seneca Indians, the Mattaponi Indians took refuge with the Chickahominy Indians, and the history of the 2 groups was intertwined for many years thereafter;

(8) in 1695, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians—

(A) were assigned a reservation by the Virginia Colony; and

(B) traded land of the reservation for land at the place known as “the cliffs” (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is the Mattaponi Indian Reservation), which had been owned by the Mattaponi Indians before 1661;

(9) in 1711, a Chickahominy boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1726, the Virginia Colony discontinued funding of interpreters for the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indian Tribes;

(11) James Adams, who served as an interpreter to the Indian tribes known as of the date of enactment of this Act as the “Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe” and “Chickahominy Indian Tribe”, elected to stay with the Upper Mattaponi Indians;

(12) today, a majority of the Upper Mattaponi Indians have “Adams” as their surname;

(13) in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, in Notes on the Commonwealth of Virginia, mentioned the Mattaponi Indians on a reservation in King William County and said that Chickahominy Indians were “blended” with the Mattaponi Indians and nearby Pamunkey Indians;

(14) in 1850, the census of the United States revealed a nucleus of approximately 10 fami-

lies, all ancestral to modern Upper Mattaponi Indians, living in central King William County, Virginia, approximately 10 miles from the reservation;

(15) during the period of 1853 through 1884, King William County marriage records listed Upper Mattaponis as “Indians” in marrying people residing on the reservation;

(16) during the period of 1884 through the present, county marriage records usually refer to Upper Mattaponis as “Indians”;

(17) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney heard about the Upper Mattaponi Indians but did not visit them;

(18) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians with a section on the Upper Mattaponis;

(19) from 1929 until 1930, the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians opposed the use of a “colored” designation in the 1930 United States census and won a compromise in which the Indian ancestry of the Upper Mattaponis was recorded but questioned;

(20) during the period of 1942 through 1945—

(A) the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians, with the help of Frank Speck and others, fought against the induction of young men of the Tribe into “colored” units in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) a tribal roll for the Upper Mattaponi Indians was compiled;

(21) from 1945 to 1946, negotiations took place to admit some of the young people of the Upper Mattaponi to high schools for Federal Indians (especially at Cherokee) because no high school coursework was available for Indians in Virginia schools; and

(22) in 1983, the Upper Mattaponi Indians applied for and won State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Upper Mattaponi Tribe.

SEC. 303. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area within 25 miles of the Sharon Indian School at 13383 King William Road, King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 304. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

- (1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or
- (2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 306. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers to the Secretary land within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and Queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—

(1) GAMING.—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 307. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.**SEC. 401. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) during the initial months after Virginia was settled, the Rappahannock Indians had 3 encounters with Captain John Smith;

(2) the first encounter occurred when the Rappahannock weroance (headman)—

(A) traveled to Quiyocohannock (a principal town across the James River from Jamestown), where he met with Smith to determine whether Smith had been the “great man” who had previously sailed into the Rappahannock River, killed a Rappahannock weroance, and kidnapped Rappahannock people; and

(B) determined that Smith was too short to be that “great man”;

(3) on a second meeting, during John Smith’s captivity (December 16, 1607 to January 8, 1608), Smith was taken to the Rappahannock principal village to show the people that Smith was not the “great man”;

(4) a third meeting took place during Smith’s exploration of the Chesapeake Bay (July to September 1608), when, after the Moraughtacund Indians had stolen 3 women from the Rappahannock King, Smith was prevailed upon to facilitate a peaceful truce between the Rappahannock and the Moraughtacund Indians;

(5) in the settlement, Smith had the 2 Indian tribes meet on the spot of their first fight;

(6) when it was established that both groups wanted peace, Smith told the Rappahannock King to select which of the 3 stolen women he wanted;

(7) the Moraughtacund King was given second choice among the 2 remaining women,

and Mosco, a Wighcocomoco (on the Potomac River) guide, was given the third woman;

(8) in 1645, Captain William Claiborne tried unsuccessfully to establish treaty relations with the Rappahannocks, as the Rappahannocks had not participated in the Pamunkey-led uprising in 1644, and the English wanted to “treat with the Rappahannocks or any other Indians not in amity with Opechancanough, concerning serving the county against the Pamunkeys”;

(9) in April 1651, the Rappahannocks conveyed a tract of land to an English settler, Colonel Morre Fauntleroy;

(10) the deed for the conveyance was signed by Accopatough, weroance of the Rappahannock Indians;

(11) in September 1653, Lancaster County signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians, the terms of which treaty—

(A) gave Rappahannocks the rights of Englishmen in the county court; and

(B) attempted to make the Rappahannocks more accountable under English law;

(12) in September 1653, Lancaster County defined and marked the bounds of its Indian settlements;

(13) according to the Lancaster clerk of court, “the tribe called the great Rappahannocks lived on the Rappahannock Creek just across the river above Tappahannock”;

(14) in September 1656, (Old) Rappahannock County (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is comprised of Richmond and Essex Counties, Virginia) signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians that—

(A) mirrored the Lancaster County treaty from 1653; and

(B) stated that—

(i) Rappahannocks were to be rewarded, in Roanoke, for returning English fugitives; and

(ii) the English encouraged the Rappahannocks to send their children to live among the English as servants, who the English promised would be well-treated;

(15) in 1658, the Virginia Assembly revised a 1652 Act stating that “there be no grants of land to any Englishman whatsoever de futuro until the Indians be first served with the proportion of 50 acres of land for each bowman”;

(16) in 1669, the colony conducted a census of Virginia Indians;

(17) as of the date of that census—

(A) the majority of the Rappahannocks were residing at their hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River; and

(B) at the time of the visit, census-takers were counting only the Indian tribes along the rivers, which explains why only 30 Rappahannock bowmen were counted on that river;

(18) the Rappahannocks used the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River as their primary residence until the Rappahannocks were removed in 1684;

(19) in May 1677, the Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed with England;

(20) the Pamunkey Queen Cockacoeske signed on behalf of the Rappahannocks, “who were supposed to be her tributaries”, but before the treaty could be ratified, the Queen of Pamunkey complained to the Virginia Colonial Council “that she was having trouble with Rappahannocks and Chickahominies, supposedly tributaries of hers”;

(21) in November 1682, the Virginia Colonial Council established a reservation for the Rappahannock Indians of 3,474 acres “about the town where they dwelt”;

(22) the Rappahannock “town” was the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River, where the Rappahannocks had lived throughout the 1670s;

(23) the acreage allotment of the reservation was based on the 1658 Indian land act, which translates into a bowman population of 70, or an approximate total Rappahannock population of 350;

(24) in 1683, following raids by Iroquoian warriors on both Indian and English settlements, the Virginia Colonial Council ordered the Rappahannocks to leave their reservation and unite with the Nanzatico Indians at Nanzatico Indian Town, which was located across and up the Rappahannock River some 30 miles;

(25) between 1687 and 1699, the Rappahannocks migrated out of Nanzatico, returning to the south side of the Rappahannock River at Portobacco Indian Town;

(26) in 1706, by order of Essex County, Lieutenant Richard Covington “escorted” the Portobaccos and Rappahannocks out of Portobacco Indian Town, out of Essex County, and into King and Queen County where they settled along the ridgeline between the Rappahannock and Mattaponi Rivers, the site of their ancient hunting village and 1682 reservation;

(27) during the 1760s, 3 Rappahannock girls were raised on Thomas Nelson’s Bleak Hill Plantation in King William County;

(28) of those girls—

(A) 1 married a Saunders man;

(B) 1 married a Johnson man; and

(C) 1 had 2 children, Edmund and Carter Nelson, fathered by Thomas Cary Nelson;

(29) in the 19th century, those Saunders, Johnson, and Nelson families are among the core Rappahannock families from which the modern Tribe traces its descent;

(30) in 1819 and 1820, Edward Bird, John Bird (and his wife), Carter Nelson, Edmund Nelson, and Carter Spurlock (all Rappahannock ancestors) were listed on the tax roles of King and Queen County and taxed at the county poor rate;

(31) Edmund Bird was added to the tax roles in 1821;

(32) those tax records are significant documentation because the great majority of pre-1864 records for King and Queen County were destroyed by fire;

(33) beginning in 1819, and continuing through the 1880s, there was a solid Rappahannock presence in the membership at Upper Essex Baptist Church;

(34) that was the first instance of conversion to Christianity by at least some Rappahannock Indians;

(35) while 26 identifiable and traceable Rappahannock surnames appear on the pre-1863 membership list, and 28 were listed on the 1863 membership roster, the number of surnames listed had declined to 12 in 1878 and had risen only slightly to 14 by 1888;

(36) a reason for the decline is that in 1870, a Methodist circuit rider, Joseph Mastin, secured funds to purchase land and construct St. Stephens Baptist Church for the Rappahannocks living nearby in Caroline County;

(37) Mastin referred to the Rappahannocks during the period of 1850 to 1870 as “Indians, having a great need for moral and Christian guidance”;

(38) St. Stephens was the dominant tribal church until the Rappahannock Indian Baptist Church was established in 1964;

(39) at both churches, the core Rappahannock family names of Bird, Clarke, Fortune, Johnson, Nelson, Parker, and Richardson predominate;

(40) during the early 1900’s, James Mooney, noted anthropologist, maintained correspondence with the Rappahannocks, surveying them and instructing them on how to formalize their tribal government;

(41) in November 1920, Speck visited the Rappahannocks and assisted them in organizing the fight for their sovereign rights;

(42) in 1921, the Rappahannocks were granted a charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia formalizing their tribal government;

(43) Speck began a professional relationship with the Tribe that would last more than 30 years and document Rappahannock history and traditions as never before;

(44) in April 1921, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson asked the Governor of Virginia, Westmoreland Davis, to forward a proclamation to the President of the United States, along with an appended list of tribal members and a handwritten copy of the proclamation itself;

(45) the letter concerned Indian freedom of speech and assembly nationwide;

(46) in 1922, the Rappahannocks established a formal school at Lloyds, Essex County, Virginia;

(47) prior to establishment of the school, Rappahannock children were taught by a tribal member in Central Point, Caroline County, Virginia;

(48) in December 1923, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson testified before Congress appealing for a \$50,000 appropriation to establish an Indian school in Virginia;

(49) in 1930, the Rappahannocks were engaged in an ongoing dispute with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States Census Bureau about their classification in the 1930 Federal census;

(50) in January 1930, Rappahannock Chief Otho S. Nelson wrote to Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician of the United States Census Bureau, asking that the 218 enrolled Rappahannocks be listed as Indians;

(51) in February 1930, Truesdell replied to Nelson saying that "special instructions" were being given about classifying Indians;

(52) in April 1930, Nelson wrote to William M. Steuart at the Census Bureau asking about the enumerators' failure to classify his people as Indians, saying that enumerators had not asked the question about race when they interviewed his people;

(53) in a followup letter to Truesdell, Nelson reported that the enumerators were "flatly denying" his people's request to be listed as Indians and that the race question was completely avoided during interviews;

(54) the Rappahannocks had spoken with Caroline and Essex County enumerators, and with John M.W. Green at that point, without success;

(55) Nelson asked Truesdell to list people as Indians if he sent a list of members;

(56) the matter was settled by William Steuart, who concluded that the Bureau's rule was that people of Indian descent could be classified as "Indian" only if Indian "blood" predominated and "Indian" identity was accepted in the local community;

(57) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau classed all nonreservation Indians as "Negro", and it failed to see why "an exception should be made" for the Rappahannocks;

(58) therefore, in 1925, the Indian Rights Association took on the Rappahannock case to assist the Rappahannocks in fighting for their recognition and rights as an Indian tribe;

(59) during the Second World War, the Pamunkeys, Mattaponis, Chickahomnies, and Rappahannocks had to fight the draft boards with respect to their racial identities;

(60) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau insisted that certain Indian draftees be inducted into Negro units;

(61) finally, 3 Rappahannocks were convicted of violating the Federal draft laws and, after spending time in a Federal prison, were granted conscientious objector status and served out the remainder of the war working in military hospitals;

(62) in 1943, Frank Speck noted that there were approximately 25 communities of Indi-

ans left in the Eastern United States that were entitled to Indian classification, including the Rappahannocks;

(63) in the 1940s, Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician, of the United States Census Bureau, listed 118 members in the Rappahannock Tribe in the Indian population of Virginia;

(64) on April 25, 1940, the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior included the Rappahannocks on a list of Indian tribes classified by State and by agency;

(65) in 1948, the Smithsonian Institution Annual Report included an article by William Harlen Gilbert entitled, "Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States", which included and described the Rappahannock Tribe;

(66) in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Rappahannocks operated a school at Indian Neck;

(67) the State agreed to pay a tribal teacher to teach 10 students bused by King and Queen County to Sharon Indian School in King William County, Virginia;

(68) in 1965, Rappahannock students entered Marriott High School (a white public school) by executive order of the Governor of Virginia;

(69) in 1972, the Rappahannocks worked with the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans to fight for Federal recognition;

(70) in 1979, the Coalition established a pottery and artisans company, operating with other Virginia tribes;

(71) in 1980, the Rappahannocks received funding through the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop an economic program for the Tribe; and

(72) in 1983, the Rappahannocks received State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Tribe" means the organization possessing the legal name Rappahannock Tribe, Inc.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term "Tribe" does not include any other Indian tribe, subtribe, band, or splinter group the members of which represent themselves as Rappahannock Indians.

SEC. 403. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of King and Queen County, Caroline County, Essex County, Spotsylvania County, Stafford County, and Richmond County, Virginia.

SEC. 404. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 406. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers to the Secretary land within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Stafford County, Spotsylvania County, Richmond County, Essex County, and Caroline County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—

(1) GAMING.—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 407. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

SEC. 501. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) In 1677, the Monacan Tribe signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation between Charles II of England and 12 Indian "Kings and Chief Men";

(2) in 1722, in the Treaty of Albany, Governor Spotswood negotiated to save the Virginia Indians from extinction at the hands of the Iroquois;

(3) specifically mentioned in the negotiations were the Monacan tribes of the Totero (Tutelo), Saponi, Ocheneeches (Occaneechi), Stengenocks, and Meipontskys;

(4) in 1790, the first national census recorded Benjamin Evans and Robert Johns, both ancestors of the present Monacan community, listed as "white" with mulatto children;

(5) in 1782, tax records also began for those families;

(6) in 1850, the United States census recorded 29 families, mostly large, with Monacan surnames, the members of which are genealogically related to the present community;

(7) in 1870, a log structure was built at the Bear Mountain Indian Mission;

(8) in 1908, the structure became an Episcopal Mission and, as of the date of enactment of this Act, the structure is listed as a

landmark on the National Register of Historic Places;

(9) in 1920, 304 Amherst Indians were identified in the United States census;

(10) from 1930 through 1931, numerous letters from Monacans to the Bureau of the Census resulted from the decision of Dr. Walter Plecker, former head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the State of Virginia, not to allow Indians to register as Indians for the 1930 census;

(11) the Monacans eventually succeeded in being allowed to claim their race, albeit with an asterisk attached to a note from Dr. Plecker stating that there were no Indians in Virginia;

(12) in 1947, D'Arcy McNickle, a Salish Indian, saw some of the children at the Amherst Mission and requested that the Cherokee Agency visit them because they appeared to be Indian;

(13) that letter was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Illinois;

(14) Chief Jarrett Blythe of the Eastern Band of Cherokee did visit the Mission and wrote that he "would be willing to accept these children in the Cherokee school";

(15) in 1979, a Federal Coalition of Eastern Native Americans established the entity known as "Monacan Co-operative Pottery" at the Amherst Mission;

(16) some important pieces were produced at Monacan Co-operative Pottery, including a piece that was sold to the Smithsonian Institution;

(17) the Mattaponi-Pamunkey-Monacan Consortium, established in 1981, has since been organized as a nonprofit corporation that serves as a vehicle to obtain funds for those Indian tribes from the Department of Labor under Native American programs;

(18) in 1989, the Monacan Tribe was recognized by the State of Virginia, which enabled the Tribe to apply for grants and participate in other programs; and

(19) in 1993, the Monacan Tribe received tax-exempt status as a nonprofit corporation from the Internal Revenue Service.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Monacan Indian Nation.

SEC. 503. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of all land within 25 miles from the center of Amherst, Virginia.

SEC. 504. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 506. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers to the Secretary any land within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—

(1) GAMING.—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 507. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 601. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1607 until 1646, Nansemond Indians—

(A) lived approximately 30 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) after 1646, there were 2 sections of Nansemonds in communication with each other, the Christianized Nansemonds in Norfolk County, who lived as citizens, and the traditionalist Nansemonds, who lived further west;

(3) in 1638, according to an entry in a 17th century sermon book still owned by the Chief's family, a Norfolk County Englishman married a Nansemond woman;

(4) that man and woman are lineal ancestors of all of members of the Nansemond Indian tribe alive as of the date of enactment of this Act, as are some of the traditionalist Nansemonds;

(5) in 1669, the 2 Nansemond sections appeared in Virginia Colony's census of Indian bowmen;

(6) in 1677, Nansemond Indians were signatories to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1700 and 1704, the Nansemonds and other Virginia Indian tribes were prevented by Virginia Colony from making a separate peace with the Iroquois;

(8) Virginia represented those Indian tribes in the final Treaty of Albany, 1722;

(9) in 1711, a Nansemond boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1727, Norfolk County granted William Bass and his kinsmen the "Indian privileges" of clearing swamp land and bearing arms (which privileges were forbidden to other nonwhites) because of their Nansemond ancestry, which meant that Bass and his kinsmen were original inhabitants of that land;

(11) in 1742, Norfolk County issued a certificate of Nansemond descent to William Bass;

(12) from the 1740s to the 1790s, the traditionalist section of the Nansemond tribe, 40 miles west of the Christianized Nansemonds, was dealing with reservation land;

(13) the last surviving members of that section sold out in 1792 with the permission of the State of Virginia;

(14) in 1797, Norfolk County issued a certificate stating that William Bass was of Indian and English descent, and that his Indian line of ancestry ran directly back to the early 18th century elder in a traditionalist section of Nansemonds on the reservation;

(15) in 1833, Virginia enacted a law enabling people of European and Indian descent to obtain a special certificate of ancestry;

(16) the law originated from the county in which Nansemonds lived, and mostly Nansemonds, with a few people from other counties, took advantage of the new law;

(17) a Methodist mission established around 1850 for Nansemonds is currently a standard Methodist congregation with Nansemond members;

(18) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney—

(A) visited the Nansemonds; and

(B) completed a tribal census that counted 61 households and was later published;

(19) in 1922, Nansemonds were given a special Indian school in the segregated school system of Norfolk County;

(20) the school survived only a few years;

(21) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians that included a section on the Nansemonds; and

(22) the Nansemonds were organized formally, with elected officers, in 1984, and later applied for and received State recognition.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

SEC. 603. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, Virginia.

SEC. 604. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—
(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 606. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, not later than 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe transfers any land within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia, the Secretary shall take the land into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) **GAMING.**—

(1) **GAMING.**—No reservation or tribal land or land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe or a member of the Tribe shall be eligible to satisfy the terms for an exception under section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(B)) to the prohibition on gaming on land acquired by the Secretary in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after October 17, 1988, under section 20(a) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(a)).

(2) **APPROVAL OF COMPACTS.**—No compact for class III gaming shall be valid unless approved or ratified by the Virginia General Assembly.

SEC. 607. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore.** Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in House Report 110-130, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1294

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2007”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Federal recognition.

Sec. 104. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 105. Governing body.

Sec. 106. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 107. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

Sec. 201. Findings.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. Federal recognition.

Sec. 204. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 205. Governing body.

Sec. 206. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 207. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

Sec. 301. Findings.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Federal recognition.

Sec. 304. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 305. Governing body.

Sec. 306. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 307. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

Sec. 401. Findings.

Sec. 402. Definitions.

Sec. 403. Federal recognition.

Sec. 404. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 405. Governing body.

Sec. 406. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 407. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Sec. 501. Findings.

Sec. 502. Definitions.

Sec. 503. Federal recognition.

Sec. 504. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 505. Governing body.

Sec. 506. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 507. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 601. Findings.

Sec. 602. Definitions.

Sec. 603. Federal recognition.

Sec. 604. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 605. Governing body.

Sec. 606. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 607. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York Mattaponi River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(12) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(13) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(14) in 1919, C. Lee Moore, Auditor of Public Accounts for Virginia, told Chickahominy Chief O.W. Adkins that he had instructed the Commissioner of Revenue for Charles City County to record Chickahominy tribal members on the county tax rolls as Indian, and not as white or colored;

(15) during the period of 1920 through 1930, various Governors of the Commonwealth of Virginia wrote letters of introduction for Chickahominy Chiefs who had official business with Federal agencies in Washington, DC;

(16) in 1934, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, requesting money to acquire land for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe's use, to build school, medical, and library facilities and to buy tractors, implements, and seed;

(17) in 1934, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, wrote to Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins, informing him that Congress had passed the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”) (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), but had not made the appropriation to fund the Act;

(18) in 1942, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for help in getting the proper racial designation on Selective Service records for Chickahominy soldiers;

(19) in 1943, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asked Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News-Leader newspaper of Richmond, Virginia, to help Virginia Indians obtain proper racial designation on birth records;

(20) Collier stated that his office could not officially intervene because it had no responsibility for the Virginia Indians, “as a matter largely of historical accident”, but was “interested in them as descendants of the original inhabitants of the region”;

(21) in 1948, the Veterans' Education Committee of the Virginia State Board of Education approved Samaria Indian School to provide training to veterans;

(22) that school was established and run by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe;

(23) in 1950, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe purchased and donated to the Charles City County School Board land to be used to build a modern school for students of the Chickahominy and other Virginia Indian tribes;

(24) the Samaria Indian School included students in grades 1 through 8;

(25) In 1961, Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, requested Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins to provide assistance in analyzing the status of the constitutional rights of Indians “in your area”;

(26) in 1967, the Charles City County school board closed Samaria Indian School and converted the school to a countywide primary school as a step toward full school integration of Indian and non-Indian students;

(27) in 1972, the Charles City County school board began receiving funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) on behalf of Chickahominy students, which funding is provided as of the date of enactment of this Act under title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aaa et seq.);

(28) in 1974, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe bought land and built a tribal center using

monthly pledges from tribal members to finance the transactions;

(29) in 1983, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was granted recognition as an Indian tribe by the Commonwealth of Virginia, along with 5 other Indian tribes; and

(30) in 1985, Governor Gerald Baliles was the special guest at an intertribal Thanksgiving Day dinner hosted by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 104. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 106. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 107. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 108. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on; and

(2) all civil actions that arise on,

lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1870, a census revealed an enclave of Indians in New Kent County that is believed to be the beginning of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(12) other records were destroyed when the New Kent County courthouse was burned, leaving a State census as the only record covering that period;

(13) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(14) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(15) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(16) in 1910, a 1-room school covering grades 1 through 8 was established in New Kent County

for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(17) during the period of 1920 through 1921, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division began forming a tribal government;

(18) E.P. Bradby, the founder of the Tribe, was elected to be Chief;

(19) in 1922, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church was organized;

(20) in 1925, a certificate of incorporation was issued to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(21) in 1950, the 1-room Indian school in New Kent County was closed and students were bused to Samaria Indian School in Charles City County;

(22) in 1967, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe and the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division lost their schools as a result of the required integration of students;

(23) during the period of 1982 through 1984, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church built a new sanctuary to accommodate church growth;

(24) in 1983 the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted State recognition along with 5 other Virginia Indian tribes;

(25) in 1985—

(A) the Virginia Council on Indians was organized as a State agency; and

(B) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted a seat on the Council;

(26) in 1988, a nonprofit organization known as the “United Indians of Virginia” was formed; and

(27) Chief Marvin “Strongoak” Bradby of the Eastern Band of the Chickahominy presently chairs the organization.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all future services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 204. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 206. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 207. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 208. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on; and

(2) all civil actions that arise on, lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the period of 1607 through 1646, the Chickahominy Indian Tribes—

(A) lived approximately 20 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) Mattaponi Indians, who later joined the Chickahominy Indians, lived a greater distance from Jamestown;

(3) in 1646, the Chickahominy Indians moved to Mattaponi River basin, away from the English;

(4) in 1661, the Chickahominy Indians sold land at a place known as “the cliffs” on the Mattaponi River;

(5) in 1669, the Chickahominy Indians—

(A) appeared in the Virginia Colony’s census of Indian bowmen; and

(B) lived in “New Kent” County, which included the Mattaponi River basin at that time;

(6) in 1677, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians were subjects of the Queen of Pamunkey, who was a signatory to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1683, after a Mattaponi town was attacked by Seneca Indians, the Mattaponi Indians took refuge with the Chickahominy Indians, and the history of the 2 groups was intertwined for many years thereafter;

(8) in 1695, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians—

(A) were assigned a reservation by the Virginia Colony; and

(B) traded land of the reservation for land at the place known as “the cliffs” (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is the Mattaponi Indian Reservation), which had been owned by the Mattaponi Indians before 1661;

(9) in 1711, a Chickahominy boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1726, the Virginia Colony discontinued funding of interpreters for the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indian Tribes;

(11) James Adams, who served as an interpreter to the Indian tribes known as of the date of enactment of this Act as the “Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe” and “Chickahominy Indian Tribe”, elected to stay with the Upper Mattaponi Indians;

(12) today, a majority of the Upper Mattaponi Indians have “Adams” as their surname;

(13) in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, in Notes on the Commonwealth of Virginia, mentioned the Mattaponi Indians on a reservation in King William County and said that Chickahominy Indians were “blended” with the Mattaponi Indians and nearby Pamunkey Indians;

(14) in 1850, the census of the United States revealed a nucleus of approximately 10 families, all ancestral to modern Upper Mattaponi Indians, living in central King William County, Virginia, approximately 10 miles from the reservation;

(15) during the period of 1853 through 1884, King William County marriage records listed Upper Mattaponis as “Indians” in marrying people residing on the reservation;

(16) during the period of 1884 through the present, county marriage records usually refer to Upper Mattaponis as “Indians”;

(17) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney heard about the Upper Mattaponi Indians but did not visit them;

(18) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians with a section on the Upper Mattaponis;

(19) from 1929 until 1930, the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians opposed the use of a “colored” designation in the 1930 United States census and won a compromise in which the Indian ancestry of the Upper Mattaponis was recorded but questioned;

(20) during the period of 1942 through 1945—

(A) the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians, with the help of Frank Speck and others, fought against the induction of young men of the Tribe into “colored” units in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) a tribal roll for the Upper Mattaponi Indians was compiled;

(21) from 1945 to 1946, negotiations took place to admit some of the young people of the Upper Mattaponi to high schools for Federal Indians (especially at Cherokee) because no high school coursework was available for Indians in Virginia schools; and

(22) in 1983, the Upper Mattaponi Indians applied for and won State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Upper Mattaponi Tribe.

SEC. 303. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area within 25 miles of the Sharon Indian School at 13383 King William Road, King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 304. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 306. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 307. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 308. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on; and

(2) all civil actions that arise on,

lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.**SEC. 401. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) during the initial months after Virginia was settled, the Rappahannock Indians had 3 encounters with Captain John Smith;

(2) the first encounter occurred when the Rappahannock weroance (headman)—

(A) traveled to Quiyocohannock (a principal town across the James River from Jamestown), where he met with Smith to determine whether Smith had been the “great man” who had previously sailed into the Rappahannock River, killed a Rappahannock weroance, and kidnapped Rappahannock people; and

(B) determined that Smith was too short to be that “great man”;

(3) on a second meeting, during John Smith’s captivity (December 16, 1607 to January 8, 1608), Smith was taken to the Rappahannock principal village to show the people that Smith was not the “great man”;

(4) a third meeting took place during Smith’s exploration of the Chesapeake Bay (July to September 1608), when, after the Moraughtacund Indians had stolen 3 women from the Rappahannock King, Smith was prevailed upon to facilitate a peaceful truce between the Rappahannock and the Moraughtacund Indians;

(5) in the settlement, Smith had the 2 Indian tribes meet on the spot of their first fight;

(6) when it was established that both groups wanted peace, Smith told the Rappahannock King to select which of the 3 stolen women he wanted;

(7) the Moraughtacund King was given second choice among the 2 remaining women, and Mosco, a Wighcocomoco (on the Potomac River) guide, was given the third woman;

(8) in 1645, Captain William Claiborne tried unsuccessfully to establish treaty relations with the Rappahannocks, as the Rappahannocks had not participated in the Pamunkey-led uprising in 1644, and the English wanted to “treat with the Rappahannocks or any other Indians not in amity with Opechancanough, concerning serving the county against the Pamunkeys”;

(9) in April 1651, the Rappahannocks conveyed a tract of land to an English settler, Colonel Morre Fauntleroy;

(10) the deed for the conveyance was signed by Accopatough, weroance of the Rappahannock Indians;

(11) in September 1653, Lancaster County signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians, the terms of which treaty—

(A) gave Rappahannocks the rights of Englishmen in the county court; and

(B) attempted to make the Rappahannocks more amicable under English law;

(12) in September 1653, Lancaster County defined and marked the bounds of its Indian settlements;

(13) according to the Lancaster clerk of court, “the tribe called the great Rappahannocks lived on the Rappahannock Creek just across the river above Tappahannock”;

(14) in September 1656, (Old) Rappahannock County (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is comprised of Richmond and Essex Counties, Virginia) signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians that—

(A) mirrored the Lancaster County treaty from 1653; and

(B) stated that—

(i) Rappahannocks were to be rewarded, in Roanoke, for returning English fugitives; and

(ii) the English encouraged the Rappahannocks to send their children to live among the English as servants, who the English promised would be well-treated;

(15) in 1658, the Virginia Assembly revised a 1652 Act stating that “there be no grants of land

to any Englishman whatsoever de futuro until the Indians be first served with the proportion of 50 acres of land for each bouman”;

(16) in 1669, the colony conducted a census of Virginia Indians;

(17) as of the date of that census—

(A) the majority of the Rappahannocks were residing at their hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River; and

(B) at the time of the visit, census-takers were counting only the Indian tribes along the rivers, which explains why only 30 Rappahannock bowmen were counted on that river;

(18) the Rappahannocks used the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River as their primary residence until the Rappahannocks were removed in 1684;

(19) in May 1677, the Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed with England;

(20) the Pamunkey Queen Cockacoeske signed on behalf of the Rappahannocks, “who were supposed to be her tributaries”, but before the treaty could be ratified, the Queen of Pamunkey complained to the Virginia Colonial Council “that she was having trouble with Rappahannocks and Chickahominies, supposedly tributaries of hers”;

(21) in November 1682, the Virginia Colonial Council established a reservation for the Rappahannock Indians of 3,474 acres “about the town where they dwell”;

(22) the Rappahannock “town” was the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River, where the Rappahannocks had lived throughout the 1670s;

(23) the acreage allotment of the reservation was based on the 1658 Indian land act, which translates into a bowman population of 70, or an approximate total Rappahannock population of 350;

(24) in 1683, following raids by Iroquoian warriors on both Indian and English settlements, the Virginia Colonial Council ordered the Rappahannocks to leave their reservation and unite with the Nanzatico Indians at Nanzatico Indian Town, which was located across and up the Rappahannock River some 30 miles;

(25) between 1687 and 1699, the Rappahannocks migrated out of Nanzatico, returning to the south side of the Rappahannock River at Portobacco Indian Town;

(26) in 1706, by order of Essex County, Lieutenant Richard Covington “escorted” the Portobaccos and Rappahannocks out of Portobacco Indian Town, out of Essex County, and into King and Queen County where they settled along the ridgeline between the Rappahannock and Mattaponi Rivers, the site of their ancient hunting village and 1682 reservation;

(27) during the 1760s, 3 Rappahannock girls were raised on Thomas Nelson’s Bleak Hill Plantation in King William County;

(28) of those girls—

(A) 1 married a Saunders man;

(B) 1 married a Johnson man; and

(C) 1 had 2 children, Edmund and Carter Nelson, fathered by Thomas Cary Nelson;

(29) in the 19th century, those Saunders, Johnson, and Nelson families are among the core Rappahannock families from which the modern Tribe traces its descent;

(30) in 1819 and 1820, Edward Bird, John Bird (and his wife), Carter Nelson, Edmund Nelson, and Carter Spurlock (all Rappahannock ancestors) were listed on the tax roles of King and Queen County and taxed at the county poor rate;

(31) Edmund Bird was added to the tax roles in 1821;

(32) those tax records are significant documentation because the great majority of pre-1864 records for King and Queen County were destroyed by fire;

(33) beginning in 1819, and continuing through the 1880s, there was a solid Rappahan-

nock presence in the membership at Upper Essex Baptist Church;

(34) that was the first instance of conversion to Christianity by at least some Rappahannock Indians;

(35) while 26 identifiable and traceable Rappahannock surnames appear on the pre-1863 membership list, and 28 were listed on the 1863 membership roster, the number of surnames listed had declined to 12 in 1878 and had risen only slightly to 14 by 1888;

(36) a reason for the decline is that in 1870, a Methodist circuit rider, Joseph Mastin, secured funds to purchase land and construct St. Stephens Baptist Church for the Rappahannocks living nearby in Caroline County;

(37) Mastin referred to the Rappahannocks during the period of 1850 to 1870 as “Indians, having a great need for moral and Christian guidance”;

(38) St. Stephens was the dominant tribal church until the Rappahannock Indian Baptist Church was established in 1964;

(39) at both churches, the core Rappahannock family names of Bird, Clarke, Fortune, Johnson, Nelson, Parker, and Richardson predominate;

(40) during the early 1900’s, James Mooney, noted anthropologist, maintained correspondence with the Rappahannocks, surveying them and instructing them on how to formalize their tribal government;

(41) in November 1920, Speck visited the Rappahannocks and assisted them in organizing the fight for their sovereign rights;

(42) in 1921, the Rappahannocks were granted a charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia formalizing their tribal government;

(43) Speck began a professional relationship with the Tribe that would last more than 30 years and document Rappahannock history and traditions as never before;

(44) in April 1921, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson asked the Governor of Virginia, Westmoreland Davis, to forward a proclamation to the President of the United States, along with an appended list of tribal members and a handwritten copy of the proclamation itself;

(45) the letter concerned Indian freedom of speech and assembly nationwide;

(46) in 1922, the Rappahannocks established a formal school at Lloyds, Essex County, Virginia;

(47) prior to establishment of the school, Rappahannock children were taught by a tribal member in Central Point, Caroline County, Virginia;

(48) in December 1923, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson testified before Congress appealing for a \$50,000 appropriation to establish an Indian school in Virginia;

(49) in 1930, the Rappahannocks were engaged in an ongoing dispute with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States Census Bureau about their classification in the 1930 Federal census;

(50) in January 1930, Rappahannock Chief Otho S. Nelson wrote to Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician of the United States Census Bureau, asking that the 218 enrolled Rappahannocks be listed as Indians;

(51) in February 1930, Truesdell replied to Nelson saying that “special instructions” were being given about classifying Indians;

(52) in April 1930, Nelson wrote to William M. Stewart at the Census Bureau asking about the enumerators’ failure to classify his people as Indians, saying that enumerators had not asked the question about race when they interviewed his people;

(53) in a followup letter to Truesdell, Nelson reported that the enumerators were

"flatly denying" his people's request to be listed as Indians and that the race question was completely avoided during interviews;

(54) the Rappahannocks had spoken with Caroline and Essex County enumerators, and with John M.W. Green at that point, without success;

(55) Nelson asked Truesdell to list people as Indians if he sent a list of members;

(56) the matter was settled by William Steuart, who concluded that the Bureau's rule was that people of Indian descent could be classified as "Indian" only if Indian "blood" predominated and "Indian" identity was accepted in the local community;

(57) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau classed all nonreservation Indians as "Negro", and it failed to see why "an exception should be made" for the Rappahannocks;

(58) therefore, in 1925, the Indian Rights Association took on the Rappahannock case to assist the Rappahannocks in fighting for their recognition and rights as an Indian tribe;

(59) during the Second World War, the Pamunkeys, Mattaponis, Chickahomnies, and Rappahannocks had to fight the draft boards with respect to their racial identities;

(60) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau insisted that certain Indian draftees be inducted into Negro units;

(61) finally, 3 Rappahannocks were convicted of violating the Federal draft laws and, after spending time in a Federal prison, were granted conscientious objector status and served out the remainder of the war working in military hospitals;

(62) in 1943, Frank Speck noted that there were approximately 25 communities of Indians left in the Eastern United States that were entitled to Indian classification, including the Rappahannocks;

(63) in the 1940s, Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician, of the United States Census Bureau, listed 118 members in the Rappahannock Tribe in the Indian population of Virginia;

(64) on April 25, 1940, the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior included the Rappahannocks on a list of Indian tribes classified by State and by agency;

(65) in 1948, the Smithsonian Institution Annual Report included an article by William Harlen Gilbert entitled, "Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States", which included and described the Rappahannock Tribe;

(66) in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Rappahannocks operated a school at Indian Neck;

(67) the State agreed to pay a tribal teacher to teach 10 students bused by King and Queen County to Sharon Indian School in King William County, Virginia;

(68) in 1965, Rappahannock students entered Marriott High School (a white public school) by executive order of the Governor of Virginia;

(69) in 1972, the Rappahannocks worked with the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans to fight for Federal recognition;

(70) in 1979, the Coalition established a pottery and artisans company, operating with other Virginia tribes;

(71) in 1980, the Rappahannocks received funding through the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop an economic program for the Tribe; and

(72) in 1983, the Rappahannocks received State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Tribe" means the organization possessing the legal name Rappahannock Tribe, Inc.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term "Tribe" does not include any other Indian tribe, subtribe, band, or splinter group the members of which represent themselves as Rappahannock Indians.

SEC. 403. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of King and Queen County, Caroline County, Essex County, Spotsylvania County, Stafford County, and Richmond County, Virginia.

SEC. 404. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 406. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Stafford County, Spotsylvania County, Richmond County, Essex County, and Caroline County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 407. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trap-

ping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 08. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on; and

(2) all civil actions that arise on,

lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

SEC. 501. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) In 1677, the Monacan Tribe signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation between Charles II of England and 12 Indian "Kings and Chief Men";

(2) in 1722, in the Treaty of Albany, Governor Spotswood negotiated to save the Virginia Indians from extinction at the hands of the Iroquois;

(3) specifically mentioned in the negotiations were the Monacan tribes of the Totelo (Tutelo), Saponi, Ocheneeches (Occaneechi), Stengenocks, and Meipontskys;

(4) in 1790, the first national census recorded Benjamin Evans and Robert Johns, both ancestors of the present Monacan community, listed as "white" with mulatto children;

(5) in 1782, tax records also began for those families;

(6) in 1850, the United States census recorded 29 families, mostly large, with Monacan surnames, the members of which are genealogically related to the present community;

(7) in 1870, a log structure was built at the Bear Mountain Indian Mission;

(8) in 1908, the structure became an Episcopal Mission and, as of the date of enactment of this Act, the structure is listed as a landmark on the National Register of Historic Places;

(9) in 1920, 304 Amherst Indians were identified in the United States census;

(10) from 1930 through 1931, numerous letters from Monacans to the Bureau of the Census resulted from the decision of Dr. Walter Plecker, former head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the State of Virginia, not to allow Indians to register as Indians for the 1930 census;

(11) the Monacans eventually succeeded in being allowed to claim their race, albeit with an asterisk attached to a note from Dr. Plecker stating that there were no Indians in Virginia;

(12) in 1947, D'Arcy McNickle, a Salish Indian, saw some of the children at the Amherst Mission and requested that the Cherokee Agency visit them because they appeared to be Indian;

(13) that letter was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Illinois;

(14) Chief Jarrett Blythe of the Eastern Band of Cherokee did visit the Mission and wrote that he "would be willing to accept these children in the Cherokee school";

(15) in 1979, a Federal Coalition of Eastern Native Americans established the entity

known as "Monacan Co-operative Pottery" at the Amherst Mission;

(16) some important pieces were produced at Monacan Co-operative Pottery, including a piece that was sold to the Smithsonian Institution;

(17) the Mattaponi-Pamunkey-Monacan Consortium, established in 1981, has since been organized as a nonprofit corporation that serves as a vehicle to obtain funds for those Indian tribes from the Department of Labor under Native American programs;

(18) in 1989, the Monacan Tribe was recognized by the State of Virginia, which enabled the Tribe to apply for grants and participate in other programs; and

(19) in 1993, the Monacan Tribe received tax-exempt status as a nonprofit corporation from the Internal Revenue Service.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Monacan Indian Nation.

SEC. 503. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of all land within 25 miles from the center of Amherst, Virginia.

SEC. 504. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 506. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination

within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 507. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 08. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on; and

(2) all civil actions that arise on, lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 601. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1607 until 1646, Nansemond Indians—

(A) lived approximately 30 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) after 1646, there were 2 sections of Nansemonds in communication with each other, the Christianized Nansemonds in Norfolk County, who lived as citizens, and the traditionalist Nansemonds, who lived further west;

(3) in 1638, according to an entry in a 17th century sermon book still owned by the Chief's family, a Norfolk County Englishman married a Nansemond woman;

(4) that man and woman are lineal ancestors of all of members of the Nansemond Indian tribe alive as of the date of enactment of this Act, as are some of the traditionalist Nansemonds;

(5) in 1669, the 2 Nansemond sections appeared in Virginia Colony's census of Indian boumen;

(6) in 1677, Nansemond Indians were signatories to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1700 and 1704, the Nansemonds and other Virginia Indian tribes were prevented by Virginia Colony from making a separate peace with the Iroquois;

(8) Virginia represented those Indian tribes in the final Treaty of Albany, 1722;

(9) in 1711, a Nansemond boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1727, Norfolk County granted William Bass and his kinsmen the "Indian privileges" of clearing swamp land and bearing arms (which privileges were forbidden to other nonwhites) because of their Nansemond ancestry, which meant that Bass and his kinsmen were original inhabitants of that land;

(11) in 1742, Norfolk County issued a certificate of Nansemond descent to William Bass;

(12) from the 1740s to the 1790s, the traditionalist section of the Nansemond tribe, 40 miles

west of the Christianized Nansemonds, was dealing with reservation land;

(13) the last surviving members of that section sold out in 1792 with the permission of the State of Virginia;

(14) in 1797, Norfolk County issued a certificate stating that William Bass was of Indian and English descent, and that his Indian line of ancestry ran directly back to the early 18th century elder in a traditionalist section of Nansemonds on the reservation;

(15) in 1833, Virginia enacted a law enabling people of European and Indian descent to obtain a special certificate of ancestry;

(16) the law originated from the county in which Nansemonds lived, and mostly Nansemonds, with a few people from other counties, took advantage of the new law;

(17) a Methodist mission established around 1850 for Nansemonds is currently a standard Methodist congregation with Nansemond members;

(18) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney—

(A) visited the Nansemonds; and

(B) completed a tribal census that counted 61 households and was later published;

(19) in 1922, Nansemonds were given a special Indian school in the segregated school system of Norfolk County;

(20) the school survived only a few years;

(21) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians that included a section on the Nansemonds; and

(22) the Nansemonds were organized formally, with elected officers, in 1984, and later applied for and received State recognition.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

SEC. 603. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to—

(A) the existence of a reservation for the Tribe; or

(B) the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk,

Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, Virginia.

SEC. 604. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 606. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Fee lands which the Tribe seeks to convey to the United States to be held in trust shall be considered by the Secretary of the Interior under part 151 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) if such lands are located within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia. The Secretary shall make a final determination within three years of the date which the tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust. Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) *GAMING.*—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 607. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

SEC. 608. JURISDICTION OF STATE OF VIRGINIA.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The State of Virginia shall exercise jurisdiction over—

(1) all criminal offenses that are committed on;

(2) all civil actions that arise on, lands located within the State of Virginia that are owned by, or held in trust by the United States for, the Tribe.

(b) *ACCEPTANCE OF STATE JURISDICTION BY SECRETARY.*—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, after consulting with the Attorney General of the United States, all or any portion of the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia described in subsection (a) upon verification by the Secretary of a certification by a tribe that it possesses the capacity to reassume such jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1294.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I would observe that this is one of those rare moments in this body when history itself seems to hold its breath.

We are here today 400 years after the first English settlers landed in what became Jamestown, Virginia, to finally acknowledge a government-to-government relationship with some of the Indian tribes who greeted those early settlers. Reflect upon that for a moment. The ancestors of the members of these Indian tribes were there 400 years ago at Jamestown and facilitated the very founding and early development of this Nation. Spanning the entire history of this Nation, they have been here, and they have endured extreme adversity.

These Indian tribes have taken part in ceremonies with the visiting Queen of England commemorating this 400th anniversary of the establishment of Jamestown, and they are a vital part of the official activities continuing this week.

I can think of no better time than this week for Congress to step up to its responsibility by using its constitutional authority to acknowledge these Indian tribes. Simply put, the pending legislation would extend Federal recognition to six Indian tribes located within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

It is sponsored by our colleague JIM MORAN of Virginia and enjoys bipartisan support, including Virginia Representatives BOBBY SCOTT, JO ANN DAVIS and TOM DAVIS. I, too, am a cosponsor of H.R. 1294, and I am pleased that the Natural Resources ranking republican member with us today, Mr. DON YOUNG, is also a strong supporter.

Importantly, both former Virginia Governors George Allen and Mark Warner, as well as current Governor Tim Kaine, have endorsed the tribes' recognition and status as sovereign governments. The Virginia Council of Churches supports the measure as well.

The authority to recognize a government-to-government relationship with an Indian tribe is a very solemn one for the Congress. It is necessary in this case because the members of these six tribes have faced hundreds of years of discrimination, abuse, and outright attempts to extinguish their very existence and rob them of their heritage.

From 1912 to 1947, Dr. Walter Plecker, a white supremacist, set out to rid the Commonwealth of Virginia of any records that proved the existence of Indians or Indian tribes. He was instrumental in ensuring passage of the Racial Integrity Act in 1924, making it illegal for individuals to classify themselves or their newborn children as "Indian." But it went further than that, spending decades changing the race designation on birth certificates and other legal documents from "Indian" to "colored," "Negro," or "free issue." Throughout it all, the Virginia Indians

did not break, but they held firm to their culture and to their identity.

I would note that this bill is named for Thomasina "Red Hawk Woman" Jordan, whose lifelong pursuit of advancing Native American rights encompassed ensuring the promise of education for all Indians and securing Federal recognition of Virginia Indian tribes.

The pending measure was reported by the Natural Resources Committee by voice vote.

To address claims that the tribes are only interested in Federal recognition so that they may conduct gaming, all six tribes supported an outright gaming prohibition which was included in this bill. This gaming prohibition precludes the Virginia tribes from engaging in, licensing or regulating gambling pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act on their lands.

In closing, I would like to pay special homage to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) who has spent several years tirelessly working to achieve Federal recognition for Virginia's First Americans. He, Representative BOBBY SCOTT and others I mentioned, TOM DAVIS and JO ANN DAVIS, have been before our Committee on Natural Resources and testified on this issue, and I salute their superb leadership as well.

It is because of this dedication to this issue that this legislation is before us today during this historic occasion marking the 400th anniversary of Jamestown. It is time to put this issue to rest and do the right thing by extending Federal recognition to these tribes.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the pending measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from West Virginia said, I do support H.R. 1294. This bill and prior versions have been in the works over the last several Congresses. This bill is long overdue.

We have heard arguments saying that we should let the tribes undergo the Federal acknowledgment process at the Department of the Interior. This would be a reasonable argument except for the fact that the Department's process is not specifically authorized by Congress. The intentions behind the creation of the process in 1978 were honorable enough, and perhaps compelling tribes to use this process is appropriate in certain cases.

But it is a fact that the Department has not always abided by its own process in extending the recognition, or failing to extend recognition, to some legitimate tribes. It is a fact that the administrative process is bogged down

with hundreds of petitions, many of which are not filed by tribes that can demonstrate the history of the six Virginia tribes.

In the hearings held on this bill, the committee has heard convincing testimony describing the rich but sometimes sad history of the six Virginia tribes. I do not need to repeat the detailed history starting with Pocahontas and Captain John Smith. We have heard a lot of that recently.

What matters is whether or not the evidence presented to the Congress demonstrates a continuous existence of a distinct Indian community from the time of European contact to the present. And in this, the six group petitioners in H.R. 1294 pass the test with flying colors.

This legislation enjoys broad support throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. I would specifically point to the efforts of the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) who has been an untiring advocate for recognizing the Rappahannock tribe, which is in her district. She is the sponsor of H.R. 106, a bill to recognize this tribe. She is also cosponsoring the bill before us today.

Her support, as well as the support of the elected officials of Virginia, is critical. Local knowledge and interaction with the tribes is a key consideration. We are obligated to weigh this very heavily in our deliberations over this bill. We have an obligation to defer to the judgment of the Members when bills affecting their constituents are at stake.

One of the few points of opposition to H.R. 1294 concerns the issue of gaming. The bill contains a strict prohibition on any gaming in Virginia. I do not think it is fair to limit tribal sovereignty in this way. It is unfair to view recognition through the prism of Indian gaming.

However, the committee made its decision to defer to some Members of the Virginia delegation on this issue, and I reluctantly supported an amendment to add the gaming measure.

Therefore, I trust that H.R. 1294 will pass the House with a strong majority today, and I urge my colleagues to give their Virginia tribes their due.

I would like to also recognize Mr. MORAN who has done an outstanding job on this issue and has been a great promoter. I always admire those, although not in his district, that have stepped forth and carried this torch on that side of the aisle, and I do compliment him on that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I recognized the tremendous efforts of Mr. MORAN of Virginia in my opening comments, and I know he spoke on the rule on this issue, but I now recognize him again, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. JIM MORAN, for 7 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much my very good friend Chairman RAHALL. He has shown

a lot of courage and also caring and sensitivity to the situation that confronts these particular Indian tribes. I see my good friend Mr. SCOTT from Virginia, as well, who will speak to this and my good friend, the ranking minority member, Mr. DON YOUNG; and I thank him for stepping up on this, too. I know that his words are deeply felt, and his support is deeply appreciated.

I also want to compliment the staff on both sides. They have done the research. They have provided the accurate information; and without that, there would be a lot of misimpressions that would be going around the floor that could defeat this bill; but the facts are on our side, and that is because particularly the very good, hard-working staff has made sure that the facts have become public.

Let me share some of those facts with you. The argument is going to be used that these tribes should go through the regular process at the BIA, and the argument will be made that this just opens it up to gambling and there is going to be another issue in terms of the corruption that is inherent within casino gambling and so on.

The fact is that it would be virtually impossible for these Virginia Indian tribes to provide the documentation that the Bureau of Indian Affairs requires. This is a unique situation that does not apply in other States because other States did not make it legal to go into courthouses, local courthouses, throughout the State and destroy the very documentation that is now necessary.

Now, of course, the Governor of Virginia and all the previous Governors, including Senator Allen who specifically recognized these Indian tribes when he was Governor, they have all acknowledged there is no question these Indian tribes exist. In fact, they have the oldest treaty that has been in existence in the United States, 1677, signed with King Charles II.

□ 1530

But, of course, that was before there was an American government; and, as a result, ironically, we haven't specifically recognized these Indians, because they have the oldest treaty. But these were the Indians that enabled the Jamestown settlers to survive.

Here we are, the Queen is at the White House, and we are having all this pomp and circumstance, and the very Indians that enabled it to happen have not been recognized by our government and, in fact, have been treated to some of the worst injustices across this land. From 1912 to 1946, their documents were deliberately destroyed.

In 1924, there was a Racial Integrity Act passed by a white supremacist, Dr. Walter Plecker. He was head of the Department of Vital Statistics, very politically powerful. And that, in effect, made it a crime to be identified as an Indian. You had to check a box "white" or "colored" throughout the State in the parlance of that time.

My friend and colleague from Virginia knows what I mean, and he believes it, because he knows Virginia history. Many of our colleagues, though, might not believe that this could happen; and, yet, it did. It was a penalty of a year of imprisonment for identifying oneself as an American Indian. So they don't have the documentation. Bureau of Indian Affairs would say, yes, we would recognize you, there is no question you exist, but it won't be in your lifetime.

Well, 400 years. Isn't this time? Now, obviously, there has been a lot of intermarriage, but the fact is, there are records, and we can produce those records. But we don't have the time, and it doesn't seem to be fair to force these Indian tribes through a process that may fail only because of governmental action, a grossly unjust governmental action.

So gambling is not an issue. These Indian tribes, even though they should certainly be on a par with all other Indian tribes, have compromised, have accepted language that prohibits them from being able to gamble, even bingo. The State gets an enormous amount of money from lottery, but they can't participate. They have accepted that. This is a matter of pride for these Indians.

This is a matter of pride. These Native Americans want to be able to tell their children, and their grandchildren, and their grandchildren, in turn, their grandchildren, we were the ones that enabled the English settlement to survive. We have a proud tradition. We were recognized by the United States Congress.

Now, hopefully, at some point, the other compromise we have made in terms of putting land into trust, that will be rectified, too, but that's not going to be immediately put into trust. We compromised with the communities; we have gone through all of the possible procedures that might raise some objection to this.

Now, Members may come to the floor who, I suspect, have not read the bill, with some objection. I don't think it's a matter of bias, but it certainly is a matter of concern that there has been abuse on the part of some lobbyists working with Indian tribes. We understand that.

But, gosh, this is a unique situation. This is a matter of injustice that cries out to be rectified. This bill rectifies that injustice. Hopefully we can do it in time for the actual date of the English settlers landing at Jamestown. It's 400 years overdue.

Again, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and I thank the Speaker for the time. In advance, I thank my colleagues for doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, if floor procedures were to permit, I would address the members of the six Virginia tribes seeking Federal recognition.

I would say that I know their quest has been a long struggle to assert their identity and their rights.

Despite centuries of racial hostility and coercion by the Commonwealth of Virginia and others, they have refused to yield their most basic human right and have suffered and lost much.

But, throughout the centuries you have retained your dignity and supported your people.

When it appeared that no one else would, when little was available, when even the doors of the public school house were closed to your children, you have never yielded to those who said you didn't exist.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Virginia tribes that win or lose today, you have already won by refusing to yield and by remaining true and faithful to who you are.

I would also say that it has been an honor for me to have helped carry this legislation.

While it is less than ideal, it moves you closer to the day our national government recognizes you exist.

Mr. Speaker, as Member of this chamber know, the crafting of congressional legislation is far from a perfect process. But, when it speaks, it speaks with the people's voice.

Today, I encourage my colleagues to speak and finally affirm that the Virginia tribes exist and deserve Federal recognition.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a cosponsor of this legislation, who helped us tremendously in reaching the point where we are today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1294, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act.

I want to thank my colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for introducing the bill, and the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from Alaska for their leadership and cooperation in bringing the bill to the floor.

This year marks the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Virginia, the first permanent English settlement in North America. Jamestown is the cornerstone of our great republic, and its success relied heavily on the help of the indigenous people of Virginia. Virginia's Native Americans played a critical role in helping the first settlers of Jamestown survive the harsh conditions of the new world.

After the Jamestown colony weathered the first couple of years in the new world, the colony expanded, and the English pushed further inland. The same Native Americans that helped those first settlers were coerced and pushed from their land without compensation. Treaties, many of which precede our own Constitution, were often made in an effort to compensate the Virginia Native Americans. But, unfortunately, as history has shown, those treaties were rarely honored or upheld.

Like many other Native Americans, Virginia Indian tribes were marginalized from society. They were deprived of their land, prevented from getting an education and denied a role in our society. Virginia's Native Americans were denied their very funda-

mental human rights and the very freedoms and liberties enshrined in our own Constitution.

This bill on the House floor today will finally grant Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Tribe, the Eastern Chickahominy Tribe, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Tribe. The bill will ensure the rightful status of Virginia's tribes in our Nation's history.

Federal recognition will also promote tribal economic development that will allow Virginia's tribes to become self-sufficient. Those same opportunities will allow Virginia's tribes to flourish culturally and economically, and will lead to a brighter future for a whole new generation.

We have waited too long to recognize Virginia's tribes. The time has come for Congress to act. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would observe that, before the eastern counties of Virginia seceded from the Union at the start of the Civil War, the legal western counties that are now West Virginia were part of the Commonwealth of Virginia, so we, too, owe these tribes our gratitude.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1294, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act. I would like to thank Representative MORAN for his leadership, efforts and work, and also Chairman RAHALL for bringing this measure to the floor.

Several of the Virginia tribes are located within my congressional district, and I am proud to be one of the primary cosponsors of this historically significant legislation. As a former member of the Virginia Council on Indians, it is important to me that the tribes who were here before the English landing at Jamestown in 1607, receive all the rights afforded other similarly situated Indian tribes.

Often in the face of discrimination and persecution, the Virginia Indian community has strived for centuries to maintain their heritage and culture. Between 1912 and 1946 the Bureau of Vital Statistics in Virginia systematically erased all reference to Indians in public records. Additionally, Virginia's Racial Integrity Act of 1924 required all Indians to register as white or colored. These discriminatory actions and laws essentially erased hundreds of years of Virginia Indian dignity, heritage, and genealogy.

The members of these tribes have worked tirelessly and deserve greater autonomy and control to deal with tribal housing, health care and education. The six tribes were recognized by Virginia between 1983 and 1989. However, significant destruction of tribal records at the hands of the Commonwealth of Virginia have made prompt recognition and documentation through the Bureau of Indian Affairs' record intensive bureaucratic process impossible.

I believe it is appropriate that Congress take steps to federally recognize the Chickahominy, the Eastern Division Chickahominy, the Upper Mattaponi, the Rappahannock, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

It is appropriate as the Nation commemorates the 400th Anniversary of the first permanent English settlement in the New World that Congress officially recognizes the tribes who were here before Captain John Smith set foot in America. I urge my colleagues to adopt this bill and extend much deserved recognition to these Virginia tribes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding H.R. 1294, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2007. While I support granting these six Virginia tribes Federal recognition, I remain concerned about opening the door to casino-style gaming in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Virginia tribes have always contended that they have no interest in pursuing gaming. And I was encouraged when the Resources Committee adopted an amendment to limit the tribes' ability to pursue gaming. However, in recent days I have begun to hear murmurs that the language is not as strong as we have been led to believe, and the tribes are considering challenging the gaming limitation. I have always believed the tribes when they have said they do not wish to pursue gambling, so I hope that there is no truth to a challenge.

I believe it is the desire of this Congress that if challenged in court, this language would be upheld, just as similar language was upheld in *Del Sur Pueblo v. The State of Texas*, 69 Fed. App. 659. However, I urge the Senate to look closely at this bill to see if this language can be tightened and strengthened to further ensure that casino-style gambling does not come to the Commonwealth. We must ensure that this bill, while well-intentioned, does not negatively affect Virginia.

The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation should honor and recognize these tribes. However, we must continue to look for a way to grant them this recognition, without leaving our beautiful Commonwealth open to the ill-effects of gambling.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this bill to correct a long standing historical inequity.

H.R. 1294 would provide federal recognition to six American Indian tribes in the Commonwealth of Virginia. With this formal recognition our Government will extend to these tribes the respect, dignity and benefits afforded to 562 other American Indian tribes.

Despite historical records documenting the existence of these tribes dating back to the 1600s and formal recognition by the Commonwealth in the 1980s, their efforts to receive Federal recognition have been ongoing for decades.

While documents normally required by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are missing or have been altered, this was not the fault or result of tribal action. In 1997, Virginia passed legislation to correct these historical records and in 1999 passed a resolution urging Congress to grant these tribes Federal recognition.

This inequity should stand no longer. The Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Eastern Division of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe deserve to be on equal footing with other tribes in the United States. They would benefit greatly from the ability to compete for educational programs, grants and other federal services.

Mr. Speaker, this has gone on long enough. As we commemorate the 400th anniversary of

the founding of Jamestown and honor the history and courage that experience entailed, let us also honor these Native Americans who have persevered through a system of exclusion, by mandating Federal recognition.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote for this bill because I believe it represents a significant step forward in ensuring that the Commonwealth's interests are safeguarded when it comes to preventing casino-style gambling from coming to the state while providing full Federal recognition to these six Virginia Tribes.

However, I hope the Senate will take a very careful look at it before proceeding because I have already begun hearing rumors that attorneys are being consulted about ways to overturn the limitation on tribal gambling included in the legislation.

I believe the tribes when they say they aren't interested in pursuing gambling. Nevertheless, I would be extremely disappointed if there is any merit to the chatter I am hearing already—even before the bill gets out of the House—about their interest in a court challenge of the bill's gambling limitation. I certainly hope that's not true, and that what I am hearing is simply rumor.

I also must admit that I am troubled by the fact the tribes have been paying a lobbyist at least \$80,000 for the past several years to advance this legislation. I certainly hope that this bill isn't the first step down the slippery slope we've been down before relating to lobbying and tribal gambling.

In moving forward with approval of this legislation, I believe it is important to underscore Congress' basis for this gambling limitation. Under the bill, no Virginia Indian tribe or tribal member, if granted Federal recognition by H.R. 1294, would have any greater rights to gamble or conduct gambling operations under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia than any other citizen of Virginia. Further, it is the expectation of Congress that the language restricting gambling operations by Indian tribes will be upheld if it is ever challenged in court, just as similar language was upheld in *Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo v. the State of Texas*, 69 Fed. App. 659. The Natural Resources Committee testimony demonstrates Congress' basis for including this limitation in the tribes' ability to engage in gambling.

In *Narragansett Indian Tribe v. National Indian Gaming Commission*, 332 U.S. App. D.C. 429, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit applied the Supreme Court's rational basis test from *Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535 (1974), to determine that the denial of gambling opportunities under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to the Narragansett Tribe under the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act did not violate the equal protection standards of the Fifth Amendment. If the legislation before us today, H.R. 1294, is ever challenged in court, a court should similarly find a rational basis for this limitation.

Again, my concern is not with the Federal recognition of Virginia's Indian tribes. It has always been with the explosive spread of gambling and the potential for casino gambling to come to Virginia. No bill should become law unless it protects the interests of the Commonwealth.

If casino gambling were to come to Virginia, it would open the door to the myriad of financial and social ills associated with gambling.

Virginia's tourism sector, its economy and its communities are some of the strongest in the country. Places such as the Shenandoah Valley, Williamsburg and Jamestown are national treasures which draw visitors from all over the world. Small businesses thrive in Virginia. The Commonwealth's reputation would be tarnished if it allowed casino-style gambling within its borders.

As the author of legislation which created the National Gambling Impact Study Commission that released its 2-year study in 1999, I know firsthand about the devastating social and financial costs of gambling. Crime. Prostitution. Corruption. Suicide. Destroyed families. Child and spouse abuse. Bankruptcy.

This legislation, I believe, does shut the door on the opportunity for these tribes to acquire land and eventually establish tribal casinos. As I said, I know that the current tribal leadership has indicated that they do not want to pursue gambling—and I believe they are sincere. But what the leaders today say doesn't lock in the leaders of tomorrow. I have already started to worry that future leadership of the tribes will pursue establishing tribal casinos. I hope I am wrong.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of H.R. 1294, the Tomasina E. Jordon Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2006. This bill will confer long-delayed Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and Nansemond Indian Tribe.

The members of these tribes were thriving before the arrival of the first European settlers. They entered into treaties with the settlers, but as has happened all too often throughout Native American history, they lost their lands to the newcomers.

In many cases, to correct the injustice, Congress recognized its obligation to these Native Americans and funded programs benefiting them, but without Federal recognition. This bill will finally begin to make amends to these proud tribes by granting Federal recognition.

This bill will permit members enrolled as tribal members to receive benefits applicable to Indians or nations, Indian tribes or bands of Indians without regard to the existence of a reservation and regardless of the location of the residence of any tribal member on or near any Indian reservation. This is only fair. The physical location of any member should not dictate whether he or she who may be otherwise entitled to and in need of assistance, should receive benefits entitled to the Tribe.

This bill also prohibits gaming on the tribal land. It permits the Secretary of the Interior to take any land into trust for the benefit of any member of the Tribe. The bill will finally grant the protections and benefits long denied the six Indian tribes for want of Federal recognition.

The experience of these tribes is similar to that of Native Hawaiians. To correct the injustices suffered by the indigenous people of Hawaii, my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, the Honorable NEIL ABERCROMBIE, and I have introduced H.R. 505, which will lead to Federal recognition of Native Hawaiians.

We believe that the time has long passed when all indigenous people with similar histories of sovereignty lost and homelands taken are recognized and afforded the protections they deserve pursuant to Congress' plenary

powers over Indian Commerce authorized by the Constitution of the United States.

I strongly urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this bill to correct a long-standing historical inequity.

H.R. 1294 would provide Federal recognition to six American Indian tribes in the Commonwealth of Virginia. With this formal recognition our Government will extend to these tribes the respect, dignity and benefits afforded to 562 other American Indian tribes.

Despite historical records documenting the existence of these tribes dating back to the 1600s and formal recognition by the Commonwealth in the 1980s, their efforts to receive Federal recognition have been ongoing for decades.

While documents normally required by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are missing or have been altered, this was not the fault or result of tribal action. In 1997, Virginia passed legislation to correct these historical records and in 1999 passed a resolution urging Congress to grant these tribes Federal recognition.

This inequity should stand no longer. The Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Eastern Division of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe deserve to be on equal footing with other tribes in the United States. They would benefit greatly from the ability to compete for educational programs, grants and other Federal services.

Mr. Speaker, this has gone on long enough. As we commemorate the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown and honor the history and courage that experience entailed, let us also honor these Native Americans who have persevered through a system of exclusion, by mandating Federal recognition.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today, in the following order: the motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 21, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1595.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote in this series.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 21, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 364, nays 57, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—364

Abercrombie	Cooper	Harman
Ackerman	Costa	Hastert
Aderholt	Courtney	Hastings (WA)
Akin	Cramer	Hayes
Alexander	Crenshaw	Heller
Allen	Crowley	Hensarling
Altmire	Cubin	Herger
Andrews	Cuellar	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Culberson	Higgins
Baca	Cummings	Hill
Bachmann	Davis (AL)	Hinojosa
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hirono
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hobson
Baker	Davis (KY)	Hodes
Barrett (SC)	Davis, David	Hoekstra
Barrow	Davis, Jo Ann	Holden
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Lincoln	Holt
Barton (TX)	Davis, Tom	Honda
Becerra	Deal (GA)	Hooley
Berkley	DeFazio	Hunter
Berman	DeGette	Inglis (SC)
Berry	Delahunt	Inslee
Biggert	Dent	Israel
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Jindal
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Donnelly	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Blumenauer	Drake	Jordan
Blunt	Dreier	Kagen
Boehner	Duncan	Kanjorski
Bonner	Edwards	Kaptur
Bono	Ehlers	Keller
Boozman	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Boren	Emanuel	Kildee
Boswell	Emerson	Kind
Boucher	English (PA)	King (IA)
Boustany	Eshoo	King (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kingston
Boyd (KS)	Everett	Kirk
Brady (PA)	Fallin	Klein (FL)
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kline (MN)
Braley (IA)	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kuhl (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	LaHood
Ginny	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Buchanan	Fossella	Lampson
Burgess	Fox	Langevin
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lantos
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Buyer	Gallegly	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	LaTourette
Campbell (CA)	Giffords	Levin
Cannon	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Gillibrand	Lewis (GA)
Capito	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Cardoza	Gingrey	Linder
Carnahan	Gohmert	Lipinski
Carney	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Carter	Goode	Loebach
Castle	Goodlatte	Loftgren, Zoe
Castor	Gordon	Lowe
Chabot	Granger	Lucas
Chandler	Graves	Lungren, Daniel
Clay	Green, Al	E.
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Mack
Coble	Hall (NY)	Mahoney (FL)
Cole (OK)	Hall (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Conaway	Hare	Manzullo

Marchant	Pitts	Simpson
Marshall	Platts	Sires
Matheson	Poe	Skelton
Matsui	Pomeroy	Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA)	Porter	Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (NY)	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McCaul (TX)	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McCotter	Pryce (OH)	Snyder
McCrery	Putnam	Solis
McHenry	Radanovich	Space
McHugh	Ramstad	Spratt
McIntyre	Regula	Stearns
McKeon	Rehberg	Sullivan
McNerney	Reichert	Sutton
McNulty	Renzi	Tancredo
Meehan	Reyes	Tanner
Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Tauscher
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Taylor
Melancon	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Miller (NC)	Roskam	Turner
Miller, Gary	Ross	Udall (CO)
Mitchell	Rothman	Upton
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Moran (KS)	Royce	Walberg
Murphy (CT)	Rush	Walden (OR)
Murphy, Patrick	Ryan (OH)	Walsh (NY)
Murphy, Tim	Ryan (WI)	Walz (MN)
Musgrave	Salazar	Wamp
Myrick	Sali	Waxman
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Weiner
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Welch (VT)
Neal (MA)	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Neugebauer	Schiff	Weller
Nunes	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Oberstar	Schwartz	Whitfield
Ortiz	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (NM)
Pascarella	Serrano	Wilson (OH)
Paul	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Pearce	Sestak	Wolf
Pence	Shadegg	Woolsey
Perlmutter	Shays	Wu
Peterson (MN)	Shea-Porter	Wynn
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Petri	Shuler	Young (AK)
Pickering	Shuster	Young (FL)

NAYS—57

Baldwin	Jefferson	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Jones (OH)	T.
Carson	Kilpatrick	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Lee	Sherman
Conyers	Markey	Slaughter
Costello	McCollum (MN)	Stark
DeLauro	McDermott	Stupak
Dingell	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Miller, George	Towns
Farr	Mollohan	Udall (NM)
Filner	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Grijalva	Murtha	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Schultz
Hinchey	Olver	Waters
Hoyer	Pastor	Watson
Jackson-Lee	Payne	Watt
(TX)	Rahall	Wexler

NOT VOTING—11

Bean	Hulshof	Souder
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Tiahrt
Doyle	McMorris	
Engel	Rodgers	
Fattah	Ruppersberger	

□ 1609

Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. FARR, COSTELLO and MURTHA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Messrs. JEFFERSON, SHERMAN, HOYER, ELLISON, WATT and OLVER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CARSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. KILPATRICK and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, CARTER and BILIRAKIS, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays 133, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—288

Abercrombie	Cubin	Hinchey
Ackerman	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Allen	Cummings	Hirono
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Holden
Baca	Davis (IL)	Holt
Bachus	Davis, Lincoln	Honda
Baird	DeFazio	Hooley
Baldwin	DeGette	Hoyer
Barrow	Delahunt	Inslee
Becerra	DeLauro	Israel
Berkley	Dent	Issa
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson (IL)
Berry	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Bilirakis	Dingell	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Jefferson
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Boozman	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Boren	Ehlers	Kagen
Boswell	Ellison	Kanjorski
Boucher	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kennedy
Boyd (KS)	English (PA)	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kind
Brown (SC)	Farr	King (NY)
Burgess	Ferguson	Klein (FL)
Burton (IN)	Filner	Kline (MN)
Butterfield	Forbes	Kucinich
Buyer	Frank (MA)	LaHood
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Capps	Gallegly	Langevin
Capuano	Gerlach	Lantos
Cardoza	Giffords	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gilchrest	Larson (CT)
Carney	Gillibrand	Lee
Carson	Gillmor	Levin
Castor	Gingrey	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Gohmert	Lipinski
Clarke	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Clay	Gordon	Loebach
Cleaver	Granger	Loftgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowe
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lucas
Cole (OK)	Grijalva	Lungren, Daniel
Conaway	Gutierrez	E.
Conyers	Hall (NY)	Lynch
Cooper	Hare	Mahoney (FL)
Costa	Harman	Maloney (NY)
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Manzullo
Courtney	Hayes	Markey
Cramer	Herseth Sandlin	Marshall
Crenshaw	Higgins	Matheson
Crowley	Hill	Matsui

McCarthy (CA)	Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Smith (WA)
McCaul (TX)	Price (NC)	Snyder
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Solis
McCotter	Rangel	Space
McDermott	Rehberg	Spratt
McGovern	Reichert	Stark
McHugh	Reyes	Stupak
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Sutton
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Tanner
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Tierney
Melancon	Rothman	Towns
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Miller (FL)	Rush	Udall (NM)
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Miller, George	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez
Mitchell	Salazar	Visclosky
Mollohan	Sánchez, Linda	Walden (OR)
Moore (KS)	T.	Walz (MN)
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Moran (KS)	Sarbanes	Schultz
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Waters
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Watson
Murphy, Patrick	Schiff	Watt
Murphy, Tim	Schwartz	Waxman
Murtha	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Welch (VT)
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Neal (MA)	Sestak	Weller
Oberstar	Shays	Wexler
Obey	Shea-Porter	Wilson (NM)
Olver	Sherman	Wilson (OH)
Ortiz	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Pallone	Shuler	Woolsey
Pascarell	Simpson	Wu
Pastor	Sires	Wynn
Payne	Skelton	Yarmuth
Perlmutter	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Peterson (MN)		
Petri		

NAYS—133

Aderholt	Flake	Neugebauer
Akin	Fortenberry	Nunes
Alexander	Fossella	Paul
Altmire	Fox	Pearce
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Pence
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Graves	Platts
Biggart	Hall (TX)	Poe
Bilbray	Hastert	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Heller	Putnam
Blunt	Hensarling	Radanovich
Boehner	Herger	Ramstad
Bonner	Hobson	Regula
Bono	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Roskam
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Royce
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Sali
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Schmidt
Calvert	Jordan	Sessions
Camp (MI)	Keller	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Shuster
Cannon	Kingston	Smith (NE)
Cantor	Kirk	Smith (TX)
Carter	Knollenberg	Stearns
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Sullivan
Chabot	Lamborn	Tancredo
Coble	Latham	Taylor
Culberson	LaTourette	Terry
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Thornberry
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Tiberi
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Turner
Davis, Tom	Mack	Upton
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Walberg
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCrery	Walsh (NY)
Doolittle	McHenry	Wamp
Drake	McKeon	Westmoreland
Duncan	Mica	Whitfield
Emerson	Miller (MI)	Wicker
Everett	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fallin	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Feeney	Myrick	

NOT VOTING—11

Bean	Hulshof	Souder
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Tiahrt
Doyle	McMorris	
Engel	Rodgers	
Fattah	Ruppersberger	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1616

Messrs. ALTMIRE, GRAVES, and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. SPRATT, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. EDWARDS, RYAN of Wisconsin, and BARRETT of South Carolina.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1294, THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1294, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, the table of contents, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1873, SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS IN CONTRACTING ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government

Reform be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill (H.R. 1873) to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes. The supplemental report contains the estimate on the bill prepared by the Congressional Budget Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATING THE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAMESTOWN SETTLEMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 117) commemorating the 400th Anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 117

Whereas the founding of the colony at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607, the first permanent English colony in America, and the capital of Virginia for 92 years, has major significance in the history of the United States;

Whereas the Jamestown Settlement owed its survival in large measure to the compassion and aid of the Native people in its vicinity;

Whereas Native Virginia people substantially aided the Jamestown colonists with food and supplies at times that were crucial to their survival;

Whereas the Native people served as guides to geography and natural resources, crucial assistance in the Virginia colonists' exploration of the Chesapeake Region;

Whereas the Jamestown Settlement brought people from throughout the Atlantic Basin together to form a society that drew upon the strengths and characteristics of English, European, African, and Native American cultures;

Whereas the economic, political, religious, and social institutions that developed during the first 9 decades of the existence of Jamestown continue to have profound effects on the United States, particularly in English common law and language, cross cultural relationships, manufacturing, and economic structure and status;

Whereas the National Park Service, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation of the Commonwealth of Virginia collectively own and operate significant resources related to the early history of Jamestown;

Whereas, in 2000, Congress established the Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission to ensure a suitable national observance of the Jamestown 2007 anniversary, and Congress commends the Commission's hard work and dedication;

Whereas Congress reminds all Americans of the importance of their country's history and founding at Jamestown; and

Whereas the 2007 observance of the founding of Jamestown commemorates the 400th anniversary of the first permanent English colony in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the founding of the colony Jamestown in 1607 and urges

all Americans to honor this seminal event in our Nation's history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H. Con. Res. 117, a bill that commemorates the 400th anniversary of the founding of the Jamestown settlement.

H. Con. Res. 117, which has 77 cosponsors, was introduced by Representative JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia on April 18, 2007. H. Con. Res. 117 was reported from the Oversight Committee on May 1, 2007, by a voice vote.

On May 14, 1607, Indians of the Powhatan tribe of Virginia saw three English sailing ships approaching their land. The 214 people on board of the *Susan Constant*, the *Discovery*, and the *Godspeed* had departed from London 5 months earlier. They would establish on the banks of the James River what would become America's first English settlement in the new world.

While disease, famine, and continuing attacks from neighboring Indians took a tremendous toll on the settlers, only 60 of the original settlers survived just 2 years after arriving in America. England sent another three ships that arrived with supplies and new settlers to help stabilize the colony.

Jamestown survived because the colonists worked together to cultivate the swamp-like land of the Virginia island and made it suitable for the growing of tobacco. By 1620 Jamestown had shipped almost 50,000 pounds of tobacco to England. Fifty years later Virginia and Maryland would ship 15 million pounds. Jamestown depended upon its agricultural products and trade to flourish as a new colony in America.

Last Friday, on May 4, Queen Elizabeth II visited a tourist village at Jamestown to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the founding of America's first English settlement. The Queen's last visit to Jamestown was 50 years ago. Jamestown represented a government that reflected many of our Nation's democratic ideals and institutions, including the rule of law and free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to commemorate

the 400th anniversary of Jamestown and urge swift passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 117, a resolution that I have introduced to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the settlement at Jamestown. I want to thank my colleague TOM DAVIS for his work on this resolution and also the entire Virginia delegation for their support.

I feel very honored to represent the First District of Virginia, what I like to call America's First District.

As we all know, in 1607 the first permanent English colony in North America was founded in Jamestown, Virginia. As we look back on this historic time 400 years later, it is obvious that the journey that began with the settlement of Jamestown has truly changed the world. Representative government in America began at Jamestown and many of our Nation's democratic ideals and institutions, including the rule of law, free enterprise, and cultural diversity, trace their roots to that beginning. It was not a perfect beginning, but nonetheless it was the start of an experiment that changed the course of history.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the Native Americans' contributions to the early beginnings of this Nation. The Jamestown settlement owed its survival in large measure to the compassion and aid of the Virginia Indians. They provided the colonists with food and supplies at times that were crucial to their survival, and they served as guides to geography and natural resources, including the colonists' exploration of the Chesapeake Bay region. It is a fact that the settlement would not have survived without the Virginia Indians, and we owe them an enormous debt of gratitude.

As Americans, we are so blessed with the freedoms that we enjoy and with the truth for which our country stands. Many of these ideals can be traced back to Jamestown, Virginia. And I urge my colleagues to vote for H. Con. Res. 117 to commemorate the events that took place 400 years ago.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia, Representative BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 117, a resolution commemorating the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Virginia, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Virginia's, and America's, First Congressional District (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

This is truly an exciting time for the Commonwealth of Virginia and our Nation as we commemorate the 400th an-

niversary of the founding of Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in North America and the cornerstone of our Republic. I have been honored to be one of the representatives of the most historic region in America, and all of the members of the Virginia delegation have worked hard to ensure that Federal funds and services have been readily available to prepare for this historic occasion beginning back in 2000 with the establishment of the Federal Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission. And I would like to specifically acknowledge the hard work of Congresswoman JO ANN DAVIS and her staff for their tireless efforts on behalf of Jamestown's 400th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, the spotlight of the world is now shining on the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Queen of England visited our State capital in Richmond and the Jamestown settlement just last week to commemorate this historic event.

□ 1630

Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people from all over our Nation and from all over the world will descend on Virginia this year to celebrate our 400th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to visit Jamestown this year and encourage them to support this concurrent resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 400 years ago, a group of entrepreneurs from the Virginia Company landed on Jamestown Island with the intent of establishing a colony to find gold and a water route to the Orient. This landing spot became the first permanent English colony in America and would eventually become the capital of Virginia for 92 years. Built on a marshy and unhealthy site, the town suffered badly at the hands of fire and disease.

The development of this great Nation clearly did not come about easily. By the end of 1607, after a particularly harsh winter, only 60 of the original 214 settlers remained alive. The colony probably would have failed completely if it had not been for the courage and determination of Captain John Smith, who contrived to get food from the Indians, proving to be crucial for their survival.

The suffering of these early settlers continued for many years. However, by 1614, John Rolfe introduced new techniques of curing the tobacco leaf which provided the first opportunity for the settlers to finally grow a crop that would sustain them for many years to come. Tobacco became the money crop for Jamestown and, ultimately, Virginia. In a short time, every farmer in Virginia was raising and exporting tobacco.

Soon thereafter, a representative assembly called the House of Burgesses was established in the colony and met once a year. Meeting in the Jamestown

Church, it was the first legislature of elected representatives in America.

Every farmer in Virginia was granted 40 acres of land, and with the income from farming tobacco, families began to sustain themselves. This community of small farmers, the great majority, 90 percent of them, not only owned but cultivated or owned land. Today, it is hard to fathom how Jamestown of Virginia survived with the suffering, malnutrition, disease and an appalling death rate. But, here we are 400 years later celebrating the quadricentennial of these brave peoples who included not only the British colonists, but the Native Americans they met upon arrival and the Africans who became indentured servants soon after.

Furthermore, this year we have the honor to celebrate the 400th anniversary with people from around the world, including Queen Elizabeth II of England.

I wholeheartedly encourage all Americans to visit this historic site. It offers an opportunity to learn how the first settlers survived and ultimately thrived as a result of their tenacity and steadfast desire to make this a place of which we can all be proud.

Seeing how many of the democratic ideals which originated in Jamestown are still being preserved 400 years later, it is only natural for us to commemorate and honor the founding of Jamestown and how it led to the establishment of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I would hope to be one of those millions who visit Jamestown this year to celebrate its 400th anniversary. I commend Representative JO ANN DAVIS for introducing this legislation, and I urge its passage.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 117.

Mr. Speaker, 400 hundred years ago a group of entrepreneurs from the Virginia Company landed on Jamestown Island with the intent of establishing a colony to find gold and a water route to the Orient. This landing spot became the first permanent English colony in America and later became the capital of Virginia for 92 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask today that we take a moment to focus on the courage of those who lived there.

In a strange land, yet not the land they sought, in an unhealthy place plagued by disease, fire and the elements, they banded together to make a life.

And that life was not an easy one. By the end of 1607, after a particularly harsh winter, only 60 of the original 214 settlers remained alive. If Captain John Smith hadn't contrived to get food for the Indians, the American dream might well have died on those swampy shores.

Suffering and hard work were not strangers to the colonists. By 1614, the settlers had a cash crop—tobacco—and they worked hard to see that it sustained the colony.

To ensure order, they formed the House of Burgesses, the first representative assembly in America. Soon, every farmer in Virginia was

granted 40 acres of land on which to farm tobacco.

Still, they had little beyond that which they could get for themselves or the local Indians. It is hard today to fathom the courage of those who struggled against all to make the colony and their families a success.

Today, 400 years later, we honor not just those brave people but the native Americans they encountered and the Africans who became indentured servants soon thereafter.

I encourage all Americans to take a cue from the Queen of England and make the pilgrimage to Jamestown during this historic year.

I encourage them to observe first-hand the hardships endured, the friendships forged, the commitment to something more than survival—the courage to leave behind far more comfortable lives in England and take the chance of a lifetime.

These were the first Americans in many senses. They were the first to form a government, the first to be willing to push past tradition and comfort for adventure, for fairness, for democracy. That's why I am I proud to urge passage of H. Con. Res. 117.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 117, which commemorates the 400th anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown.

On May 14, 1607, just over 100 English settlers landed on the banks of the James River, in what is today the state of Virginia. The first permanent English settlement in North America, Jamestown weathered extreme hardship, starvation, and warfare to become the foundation upon which our Nation was built. We can recognize many of our democratic ideals in institutions developed by the Jamestown settlement. It was in this colony, in 1619, that the House of Burgesses, the first locally elected legislative body in the New World, was convened in a Jamestown church.

As a nation, we have come a long way since our early colonial days. We fought a war with each other to abolish slavery, which was introduced in Jamestown in the same year as the House of Burgesses. We gradually extended full citizenship and equal rights to African Americans. While the settlers that landed in 1607 were all male, we have in the past 400 years, incorporated women into all aspects of our Nation's political, economic, and social life. And while the early colonial settlements fought wars with their Native American neighbors, we have, in recent decades, made serious efforts toward making amends for injustices done to native tribes.

This resolution serves to remind and educate Americans about the importance of our history. It highlights that the economic, political, religious, and social institutions developed during our colonial past continue to form the backbone of our society today. Significantly, this resolution also draws attention to the crucial role the native people played in the success of the Jamestown colony, and in the formation of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 400th anniversary of Jamestown, this legislation urges us to understand and engage with our history as Americans. I strongly support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for this resolution.

Four hundred years ago in 1607, 104 English settlers took a dangerous voyage. The

voyage alone was perilous, but their future in their new land was no less daunting. These courageous voyagers landed on the shores of what is now the great Commonwealth of Virginia. They set sail on what many have considered America's founding river, the James River, and established the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown.

These brave settlers faced many hardships—sickness, war, hunger, and death. However, their faith and perseverance allowed this colony to flourish despite these seemingly insurmountable odds. These settlers established the foundation of this great Nation, and I am happy that we, in this House, are gathered here today to commemorate their sacrifice.

These early settlers were the first to celebrate what we have now come to know as the American dream. Kathryn Lange said it best in her book, "1607: A New Look At Jamestown," "Jamestown was a place where the poor might become rich through hard work, where people could govern themselves and where cultures mixed to create a new, American way of life."

This profound, new way of life, was unlike anything else in the world at the time. The Jamestown Colony planted the seeds of the ideals of life and liberty, which sprouted into this great Nation. As a nation we have held fast to the ideals that flourished in this early colony, and we still celebrate those ideals today.

Today we gather to commemorate that early settlement at Jamestown, but we do not commemorate just one colony, we commemorate the birth of a nation that sprung from that small colony.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 400th anniversary of the Jamestown settlement, and the birth of our Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 117.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING PUBLIC SERVANTS FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 307) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 7 through 13, 2007.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 307

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize the important contributions of public servants and

honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the Nation through work at all levels of government;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service in every city, county, and State across America and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas Federal, State, and local governments are responsive, innovative, and effective because of the outstanding work of public servants;

Whereas the United States of America is a great and prosperous Nation, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the Nation benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of these highly trained individuals;

Whereas public servants—

(1) provide vital strategic support functions to our military and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(2) fight crime and fire;

(3) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(4) deliver social security and medicare benefits;

(5) fight disease and promote better health;

(6) protect the environment and the Nation's parks;

(7) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunities and healthy working conditions;

(8) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(9) help the Nation recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(10) teach and work in our schools and libraries;

(11) develop new technologies and explore the earth, moon, and space to help improve our understanding of how our world changes;

(12) improve and secure our transportation systems;

(13) keep the Nation's economy stable; and

(14) defend our freedom and advance United States interests around the world;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight against terrorism and in maintaining homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent America's interests and promote American ideals;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, abuse, and dangers to public health;

Whereas the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, as well as those skilled trade and craft Federal employees who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the Nation and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflict in defense of this Nation and its ideals and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas government workers have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants;

Whereas May 7 through 13, 2007, has been designated Public Service Recognition Week to honor America's Federal, State, and local government employees; and

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week is celebrating its 23rd anniversary through

job fairs, student activities, and agency exhibits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great Nation during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(2) salutes their unyielding dedication and spirit for public service;

(3) honors those government employees who have given their lives in service to their country;

(4) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(5) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself such time as I might consume.

H. Res. 307 commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 7 through May 13, 2007. This resolution salutes their unyielding dedication and spirit of public service.

On Tuesday, April 17, 2007, I introduced this legislation in conjunction with Senator AKAKA, who introduced S. Res. 150 to honor and celebrate the commitment of the men and women who have dedicated their lives to serving the public.

Over 18 million individuals in cities, counties and States in America and abroad serve our government and the American people. They perform essential services that the Nation relies upon every day. Federal employees from agencies like the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and the Food and Drug Administration are committed to promoting health, advances in research, regulating industries, and ensuring the well-being and safety of our citizens.

The men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States as well as the skilled trade and craft employees who support their efforts contribute greatly to the security of our country and to the world. We cannot thank our public servants enough for the work that they do for their fellow citizens day in and day out.

Governments at all levels simply cannot function properly without good employees who are committed to public service. We should be reminded of their contributions, not just in May, but when we are setting their pay and

benefits, and by ensuring that they have the resources they need to do their jobs.

Last Wednesday, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 150, the companion bill to H. Res. 307, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I am extremely proud to rise today in support of H. Res. 307, honoring the millions of dedicated public servants that serve our Nation. Our country simply could not function without its innovative, professional, highly trained public service employees. At all levels of government you will find hard-working staff making our country prosper and thrive through their contributions. The expertise and work ethic offered by these individuals sets an honorable example for future generations of employees. From emergency responders to librarians, public servants span the spectrum of jobs that keep our country efficient and safe.

Beyond the tremendous work of civilian employees and uniformed service personnel, the members of our National Guard and Reserves are crucial to the welfare of all U.S. citizens. They provide vital strategic support for our Nation's military both at home and abroad. Their tremendous accomplishments with assisting States and countries overseas with natural disasters is to be praised.

Once again, I commend these employees for performing challenging and oftentimes thankless jobs with honor and dedication. I appreciate them for moving our country forward and maintaining our safety and security. For these reasons I am thrilled to express my support for a week of honoring these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlelady for her comments, and I appreciate her support of this resolution.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 23rd annual Public Service Recognition Week. I am proud to be a co-chair of the Congressional Public Service Caucus, proud to have been a federal employee, and proud to represent in Congress a large number of my constituents who are federal employees. These employees are a national asset who work hard day after day with professionalism and dedication.

Federal employees are the backbone of our government. They can be found working to find cures for diseases at the National Institutes of Health, helping seniors with their Social Security benefits, representing our interests overseas in the State Department, serving as stewards of America's natural resources in the National Park Service, helping our country defend the homeland at the Department of Defense and at the Department of Homeland Security. These are but a few examples of the many areas in which federal employees are serving our country.

We must not forget those federal employees who are risking their lives in the war against

terrorism. The first combat death in Afghanistan in the wake of September 11 was CIA officer Johnny Micheal Spann, one of my constituents. And today, Federal employees can be found throughout the globe fighting the war against terrorism in many different ways.

The sacrifice and hard work of our federal employees, whether abroad or at home, should never be forgotten. Federal employees deserve fair pay—which is why I have been pleased to support pay parity for federal employees since I have been in Congress.

They deserve adequate health care—which is why I have supported legislation to make sure federal employees get quality health benefits.

And retired Federal employees must not be forgotten—which is why I have supported legislation to aid Federal employees who have retired from active service. Federal employees deserve to be honored during Public Service Recognition Week. But we must always remember the they are serving our country every day of the year.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 307.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 291) supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 291

Whereas there are more than 870,000 sworn law enforcement officers throughout the United States;

Whereas law enforcement officers are dedicated to serving this country, and protecting this country and its citizens from harm;

Whereas law enforcement officers face dangers and threats to their personal safety each day;

Whereas more than 56,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted every year;

Whereas every 53 hours, a law enforcement officer in the United States is killed in the line of duty;

Whereas 143 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty in 2006, 12 fewer than the 155 officers killed in 2005;

Whereas Public Law 87-726 requests that the President issue proclamations designating May 15th of each year as National Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

Whereas section 7(m) of title 4, United States Code, requires that the flag of the United States be flown at half-staff on Peace Officers Memorial Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of House Resolution 291, which honors our fallen law enforcement officers.

H. Res. 291, which has 72 cosponsors, was introduced by Representative TED POE of Texas on March 29, 2007. H. Res. 291 was reported from the Oversight Committee on May 1, 2007, by a voice vote.

Historically, America has been blessed with citizens of courage and character who have dedicated their lives to keeping peace in our communities. Five years after the creation of the U.S. Marshals Service in 1789, U.S. Marshal Robert Forsyth was shot and killed in the line of duty. He was the first of more than 14,000 law enforcement personnel since that time to give his or her life to uphold the law.

Last year, 143 officers gave their lives in the line of duty. For these heroes, the safety of their fellow citizens was their purpose and passion. They made the ultimate sacrifice to fulfill their duty and service to humanity.

Each year, the President issues a proclamation naming May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. Our Nation owes a lasting debt and gratitude to the men and women of law enforcement who risk their lives each day to protect and serve the citizens of this Nation.

Every American should honor peace officers, not only in words and ceremony but in their commitment to promote justice, fairness and peace in their homes, communities, schools and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative POE for seeking to honor our fallen heroes, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H. Res. 291 supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State and local law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty, and encourages the citizens of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

Police officers have been protecting American citizens since April 1631, when the city of Boston first established its "night watch" law enforcement program in the colonies. There is a quote by President George H.W. Bush engraved on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial located at Judiciary Square here in Washington which summarizes the mission of the 870,000 current sworn law enforcement officers in the United States. It states that it is their daily "quest to preserve both democracy and decency, and to protect a national treasure that we call the American Dream."

Law enforcement officers face dangers on the job every single day. On May 17, 1792, New York City's Deputy Sheriff Isaac Smith became the first recorded police officer to be killed in the line of duty. Today, more than 56,000 are assaulted each year, and every 53 hours an officer is killed while serving the American people. September 11, 2001, was the deadliest day for police officers in all of American history when 72 officers were killed while responding to terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the life of Sergeant Howard Plouff from my district, who was killed recently in the line of duty. He was known as an honorable man who selflessly served his family and community for more than 17 years in the Winston-Salem Police Department. He was dedicated to community development and service. His is a legacy of the spirit of service that permeates this great country.

□ 1645

He earned the respect of his fellow officers and did not hesitate to go above and beyond the call of duty. In fact, during his time with the Winston-Salem Police Department, he was awarded its highest honor, the Medal of Valor. He left behind a loving wife and two daughters. He was an extremely positive role model and an example of all the officers we are honoring with this resolution.

May 15 is Peace Officers Memorial Day, a holiday created in 1961 by Congress to honor fallen law enforcement officers who dedicated their lives to protecting this country and its citizens. The flag is flown at half staff and thousands of people visit the memorial which was authorized by President Ronald Reagan in 1984. Built in 1989, it currently has 17,912 names etched into the wall. Each of these names reminds us of the sacrifices these brave law enforcement officers have given in order to keep American citizens safe. They also stand for those living officers who would, without hesitation, do the same to protect all of us.

With gratitude to our law enforcement officers' devotion and dedication to our country, I ask all Members to join me in supporting H. Res. 291.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate resolution that comes before us. I know that in a couple of days many of us will be out on the West Lawn commemorating and celebrating the Nation's law enforcement officers from across the Nation. We welcome them to this Congress every year, and we do so humbly and with great appreciation.

Let me acknowledge the work that many of us have done with our local law enforcement in the State of Texas. We have a multitude of law disciplines, from the constables office. I have the privilege of representing the first African American constable, Mae Walker, and representing Constable Victor Trevino, a Hispanic constable. We have deputy sheriffs. We have the sheriff's department. We have the Houston Police Department, the Department of Public Safety. In many instances we find great leaders who believe not only in crime fighting, but crime prevention.

I rise today to focus in particular on the importance of law enforcement in working in the community. I salute the former mayor of the city of Houston, Lee Brown, former chief of police of the cities of Houston, New York, and Atlanta. I consider him the father of community-oriented policing that really speaks to the hearts and minds of the people.

It lets the police officers, law enforcement officers, become knowledgeable about the community, and in particular they work to know the "good guys" and the "bad guys." Neighbors become comfortable with law enforcement officers when they are engaged as people who are certainly concerned about the neighborhood and the community. They are eager to help them bust, if you will, the crime situation or bust the criminal or make sure that the situation is corrected.

At the same time as we raise up and respect our law enforcement officers, let me applaud those who I speak to all the time as I travel to Washington. We have a very effective aviation police force. I get an opportunity as I go through the airport to listen to them and to thank them.

Let us be concerned about the benefits for law enforcement officers. In particular, I know that my city, a very large city, has seen the decline of senior officers. For some reason or another, because our belts are being tightened, we don't have enough resources to provide them with the upward mobility, the professional devel-

opment and the protection of their pensions and to recognize the sacrifice that they and their families are making. We as communities across the Nation should be concerned about making sure they have the right kind of benefits.

On the Federal level, I am very glad that the House Judiciary Committee has just passed out a COPS bill reauthorization. I think that is a very, very important aspect of the work of this Congress. The COPS program worked. It provided police officers for rural communities and urban communities. I spoke to my police personnel there and they said, yes, it would help us greatly if the COPS program were reauthorized. So as we salute our peace officers across America, let us make sure that we are actually doing as we are saying, and that is providing them with the resources that they need.

At the same time, let me also add the importance of training. There is the sensitivity that our police officers are able to get through experience, but training also helps them detect those with mental illness and have the best resources to address those suffering from mental illness so that those persons can be taken away from society before they do harm to themselves or someone else.

This legislation is timely because we thank those who are serving today. We offer our deepest sympathy to the families of those who have lost their lives on the front lines of law enforcement in America over the last year, and we certainly acknowledge the continued sacrifice that law enforcement officers will make.

The best point about what this says as we stand on the floor today saluting them is that we should promote and congratulate good law enforcement officers. We should not allow the bad incidents that occur, the mishaps that occur, and many of them have occurred, and I have stood up vigorously against them and I will stand up yesterday, today and tomorrow, when there is abuse. But we should not allow those kinds of situations to take away from the grandeur, the respect, the honesty, the integrity and the down-right commitment that the law enforcement agencies of America, particularly those in our local communities, show every single day with the idea that as they leave in the morning and kiss their families good-bye, that they might sacrifice their lives so that we might be safe.

We owe them a great debt of gratitude, and it is my pleasure to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and thank the sponsor of this legislation for allowing me to pay tribute at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 291, supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Peace officers, the sworn, public-sector officers entrusted with law enforcement authority and the power of arrest, risk their lives daily to protect our Nation. These individuals, who are

responsible for safeguarding the rights and freedoms we enjoy as Americans, are true heroes.

Peace Officers Memorial Day honors those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and security of their communities and our Nation. Created by Public Law 87-726, signed by President Kennedy in 1962, this day gives us the opportunity to acknowledge and pay our respect to those who, through their courageous deeds, have fallen in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 13, 2007, 382 names will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial during the 19th Annual Candlelight Vigil. These 382 names include 145 officers who died in the 2006, plus 237 from earlier years who had previously been lost to history. Of these 382 names, 55 represent Texas law officers who lost their lives in the line of duty, nine of them in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, one of the names of the fallen heroes to be added to the list is Officer Rodney J. Johnson of the Houston Police Department. Officer Johnson, a 12-year veteran of the Houston Police Department, was killed September 21, 2006, while taking a suspect in custody during a traffic stop. He leaves to honor his memory his beloved wife, Houston Police Department Officer Joslyn Johnson, and five teenage children; three daughters and two sons, ages 14 to 19.

Officer Rodney Johnson was born in Houston and served in the U.S. Army as a military police officer until being honorably discharged in 1990. He then went to work as a corrections officer for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and then as a jail attendant. He graduated from the Houston police academy in 1994.

As a member of the department's Southeast Gang Task Force, Officer Rodney Johnson earned two Lifesaving Awards and one Medal of Valor from the State of Texas. In January 1998, Officer Rodney Johnson rescued a physically challenged driver trapped in rising floodwaters in January 1998 and later that year he rescued mentally challenged people trapped inside of a burning house.

Officer Rodney Johnson, who stood 6 feet 5 inches tall and weighed nearly 300 pounds, served on his union's board of directors. As Hans Marticiuc, the president of Officer Johnson's union stated, "he was big and he was intimidating-looking, but he was as gentle as a baby bear."

Mr. Speaker, the number of officers killed in the line of duty last year declined nearly 8 percent from 2005, when there were 157 officer deaths. The 2006 figure was the lowest annual total since 1999, when 143 officers were lost.

Although the number of officers killed in the line of duty has declined in recent years, the fact that one officer is killed every 2½ days in our country is a sober reminder that protecting our communities and safeguarding our democracy come at a heavy price. Including this year's officers, there are now 17,917 names engraved on the Memorial, representing officers from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and Federal law enforcement and military police agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution, honoring the Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the author of this resolution.

Mr. POE. I want to thank the gentelady from North Carolina for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member DAVIS, for their support of this legislation, and, of course, the gentleman from Illinois as well.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 291 supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day, our Nation's first line of defenders. I would also like to thank the 78 Members of Congress who cosponsored this bipartisan resolution for their support.

Law enforcement officers are a special type of people. They put on the uniform and the badge of a law officer. They swear an oath to uphold the law of our land and vow to protect the citizens of all communities.

In carrying out their duties, law enforcement officers are routinely subjected to threats against their personal safety. According to the National Law Enforcement Memorial Fund, more than 56,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted every year in the line of duty. They are subjected to being slapped, punched, kicked, bit, stabbed, and even shot by suspects. And this does not include what could happen in the course of high-speed chases that occur throughout our country.

Most of these peace officers that are assaulted walk away from that fight with minor injuries and the suspect generally is carted off to jail in handcuffs. There are those community protectors, however, that aren't as fortunate, because they give their lives in the line of duty.

Since the first recorded police department death in 1792, over 17,900 peace officers have been killed while performing the duty of a law officer somewhere in this great country. Statistics show that every 53 hours a law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty. Last year, 2006, 143 officers were killed in the line of duty.

We all remember September 11 and what occurred on that day, how many of us watched on television when those planes hit the World Trade Center, when they hit the Pentagon; how thousands of people, good people, as soon as that terror hit those buildings, those people were running as fast as they could to get away from that danger.

But there was another group of people, not very many, but they were there running as fast as they could to get to the danger, and those were the people who wear the badge. That also included our firefighters and our emergency medical technicians. Seventy-two of those peace officers that ran to those buildings that were being assaulted from the air were killed in the line of duty that one day.

Of course, it strikes all communities, even our community down in Beau-

mont, Texas, and the Beaumont Police Department and its recent tragedy of a peace officer killed in the line of duty. Last week, this community suffered the loss of one of their own, Officer Lisa Beaulieu, the first female peace officer in southeast Texas that has been killed in the line of duty.

She was a 6-year veteran of the Beaumont Police Department. She was on patrol by herself at 1 a.m. when she responded to the scene of a motorcycle accident in Beaumont. As she got out of her vehicle and started directing traffic, a drunk driver slammed into her, throwing her over the side of the freeway and killing her. It was a tragic end for a peace officer that loved to protect the people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, during the time that I was a judge in Texas for over 22 years, I encountered many, many peace officers who wore the badge, and proudly did so; and I considered those peace officers who would do that, that cross over the line to represent the rest of us and protect us, a rare and noble bleed.

So on Tuesday, May 15, thousands of local, State and Federal peace officers will gather across the Nation to remember their fellow officers. Known as National Peace Officers Memorial Day, established by President Kennedy in 1962, the day serves as a tribute to the men and women who daily put themselves in harm's way to ensure the safety and security of our country and our Nation. The flags will be lowered at half mast and ceremonies will be held across the entire country.

The national memorial ceremony is held right here on the lawn of the United States Capitol, where the President of the United States, thousands of law enforcement officers, and Members of Congress will be there. Those officers that are in attendance, their badges will be draped in black as a remembrance of their fellow officers who were killed in the line of duty.

Law enforcement officers are the first line of defense between law-abiding citizens and those who violate the law. They are public servants who dedicate their time and their lives to protect us. They wear the badge of courage with pride, and we as a Nation need to honor them for their service of the American people.

I hope that our Congress, these folks in this body, will pass this legislation as fast as possible.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentelady for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here today as a cosponsor of this resolution to honor our law enforcement officers across this Nation. I was one of the 870,000 sworn law enforcement officers that are on the job today just a couple of years ago, until I came to this House. I have to be honest and

confess that my heart still lies with my fellow officers and deputies in the King County Sheriff's Office in Seattle, Washington.

I was one of those officers who have been spit on, kicked, called every name that you can think of and maybe some that you can't think of, stabbed, shot at, threatened. All of those things happened in my 33-year career.

But I am here today alive and well to talk about those officers that sacrificed their lives. Some of those were my good friends. Two were my partners. One was an academy mate. One was my best friend. Murdered. Shot and killed.

Now, just last year the King County Sheriff's Office lost another dedicated law enforcement officer by the name of Steve Cox. Imagine you are Deputy Steve Cox and you are responding to a call on an early Saturday morning back in December. You really don't know what kind of a call you are going to. But then you hear that shots have been fired. Part of your job is to interview every person at the scene, so you start to interview these people. All of a sudden, in the middle of the interview, somebody pulls a gun, and before Deputy Cox could react, he was shot in the head and killed. He left behind a wife and a 1-year-old son.

These are things that happen every day on the streets of our great Nation. We owe such a debt of gratitude to the men and women who wear the badge, whether they wear a blue uniform or green, gray or whatever color it might be, who are there to protect us from those people on our streets who choose not to obey the laws of the land.

There are four people from the State of Washington who will be added to the memorial this year: Joselito Barber from the Seattle Police Department; Edwanton Thomas from the Brier Police Department; Dick Rhodes from the Kittitas County Sheriff's Office; and Deputy Steve Cox from the King County Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, this is very close to my heart. It should be close to each and every one of us. Every time we see one of the Capitol Hill police officers or the Washington, D.C. police when we are back here, please stop and say thank you for a job well done in putting their lives and their family's lives on the line for us every day.

□ 1700

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE). Texas has lost 55 law enforcement officers. That is part of the 382 fallen officers across this Nation.

As mayor of the city of Fort Worth, when asked what was the most important thing I did when I was mayor, I always talked about working with the

Fort Worth police officers, those brave officers who risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free. We think about those officers, and we think about their families also.

One of the officers was Dwayne Freeto. He was just 34 years old when he was killed by a drunk driver just 8 days before this past Christmas. He had been a police officer with the Fort Worth Police Department since August 2005. He also served in the United States Army. When he was killed, he left behind a wife, Karen, and two daughters, ages 3 and 9.

Those stories can be repeated about our officers across this Nation so many times. I join in strong support of this resolution and also to remind everyone of the candlelight vigil this Sunday to honor those officers. They are people who sacrifice their lives every day and stand up for us. It is my great honor to speak today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for introducing this very meaningful and worthwhile legislation. I think all of us owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to our law enforcement officers and personnel throughout the country. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Peace Officers Memorial Day, honoring Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty. Our law enforcement officers dedicate and risk their lives daily to protect our Nation and ensure that our neighborhoods are safer.

More than 56,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted every year, and in 2006, 143 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty. No words can adequately express our gratitude for their sacrifice and service. My heart goes out to the families and friends who have lost loved ones in the line of duty, and to those officers who have been harmed while serving this great country.

A few months ago, Western North Carolina lost one of our own brave officers. Police Officer Shawn Joshua Dean Williams died while responding to a fellow officer's call for assistance in Old Fort, North Carolina. He was only 23 years old. He is survived by his wife, Shannon Kirby Williams; his young daughter, Ryleigh Alexis; and his parents, Max Suttles and Holly Williams.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Williams' life was an example of service for all of us to follow.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing sadness over all the officers lost in the line of duty and to acknowledge the dedication of all law enforcement officers who protect and serve our communities every day.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 291, honoring those brave officers who have paid the ultimate price in the line of duty.

May 15th marks the 44th annual Peace Officers' Memorial Day and to mark the occasion, law enforcement officers from around the Nation will gather here in Washington, D.C. This visit will include a gathering here on the Capitol lawn to pay their respects to their fallen comrades.

All of these officers—both those who have passed and those who carry on today—deserve our gratitude and our respect. But, during this time of remembrance, I would like to especially recognize those 72 brave officers who were lost on September 11, 2001, the single deadliest day in law enforcement history. Thirty-seven of those lost were officers of the New York/New Jersey Port Authority and we are eternally indebted to them for their bravery and sacrifice on that tragic day. The memory of their service and the sacrifice their families have made on our behalf should be always in our thoughts.

In our great Nation, there are 870,000 sworn law enforcement officers who risk their lives daily to ensure the safety of their neighbors. Every 53 hours one of these officers is killed in the line of duty. It is in their memory that we gather each May to pay our respects to the fallen and to honor this noble profession.

Many thanks go to the law enforcement officers in New Jersey, here at the United States Capitol, and around the United States. We thank you for your service and join you in honoring your fallen comrades.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 291, which supports the goals and ideals of National Peace Officers' Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty and calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this resolution and support the recognition of May 15th as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day, a day dedicated to the recognize and pay tribute to more than 870,000 law enforcement officers throughout the United States, and those officers who are killed or disabled in the line of duty.

It is estimated that more than 56,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted every year, and 143 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty in 2006. Of those 143 killed in the line of duty last year, we also lost two outstanding law enforcement officers, Detective Vicky Armel and Master Police Officer Michael Garbarino of the Sully Police Station of Fairfax County in Virginia.

Exactly 1 year ago today, on May 8, 2006, Detective Armel and MPO Garbarino were both shot and killed when a suspect using a hunting rifle opened fire on them in the parking lot of the Sully District Station. Detective Armel died on the scene and MPO Garbarino died 9 days later while in the hospital.

Both officers gave a combined 40 years of service, protecting our country. They died heroically trying to protect their fellow servicemen. Today, they, along with all other peace officers, are being honored in our hearts and minds. This week, a monument will be unveiled at the Sully Police Station in Fairfax honoring Detective Armel and MPO Garbarino and a full memorial service is also planned.

Detective Armel and MPO Garbarino, along with the hundreds of thousands of other law enforcement officers that serve us or were injured or killed in the line of duty, deserve our support. We owe the thousands of men and women who put their life on the line the recognition and gratitude for all their hard work, tireless efforts and daily life threatening situations that they encounter, to protect and serve us. I urge my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 291.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 291.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL SUFFRAGISTS DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) supporting the goals and ideals of a National Suffragists Day to promote awareness of the importance of the women suffragists who worked for the right of women to vote in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

Whereas one of the first public appeals for women's suffrage came in 1848 when Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton called a women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York, on July 19, 1848;

Whereas Sojourner Truth gave her famous speech titled "Ain't I a Woman?" at the 1851 Women's Rights Convention, in Akron, Ohio;

Whereas, in 1869, women suffragists formed the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association, which were national organizations designed to work for the right of women to vote;

Whereas these organizations united in 1890 to form the National American Woman Suffrage Association;

Whereas, in 1872, Susan B. Anthony and a group of women voted in the Presidential election, in Rochester, New York;

Whereas Susan B. Anthony was arrested and fined for voting illegally;

Whereas at her trial, which attracted nationwide attention, Susan B. Anthony made a speech that ended with the following slogan: "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God";

Whereas, on January 25, 1887, the United States Senate voted on women's suffrage for the first time;

Whereas, during the early 1900s, a new generation of leaders joined the women's suffrage movement, including Carrie Chapman Catt, Maud Wood Park, Lucy Burns, Alice Paul, and Harriot E. Blatch;

Whereas women's suffrage leaders devoted most of their efforts to marches, picketing, and other active forms of protest;

Whereas Alice Paul and others chained themselves to the White House fence;

Whereas women suffragists were often arrested and sent to jail, where many of them went on hunger strikes;

Whereas almost 5,000 people paraded for women's suffrage up Pennsylvania Avenue, in Washington, DC;

Whereas, on August 18, 1920, ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution was completed, thus guaranteeing women in the United States the right to vote;

Whereas July 19th is the anniversary of the first women's rights convention; and

Whereas designating July 19th as National Suffragists Day would raise awareness of the importance of women suffragists who fought for and won the right of women to vote in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideals of a National Suffragists Day to promote awareness of the importance of the women suffragists who worked for the right of women to vote in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), the author of the resolution.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding, and a special thank you to Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here today in support of a resolution that I have reintroduced that would promote the goals and ideals of creating a day in honor of the women of America's suffragist movement.

The goal of this resolution is to recognize the anniversary of the inaugural women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. The suffragists are role models who inspired an entire generation and continue to inspire generations of young American women, just as they have two young women from the State of Nevada, Hannah Low and Destiny Carroll, who started their own petition drive to pay tribute to the efforts of these great suffragists.

Hannah Low and Destiny Carroll presented a petition to me with hundreds of signatures from their fourth grade class in support of creating a day to recognize the achievements of our brave suffragists.

I cannot tell you how proud I am of Hannah and Destiny, and I thank them for serving as an inspiration for this resolution.

While it may seem unbelievable to us now, it was not that long ago that women did not have the right to vote in our great Nation. On July 19, 1848, the first public appeal for women's suffrage was made, and a new movement was born for equality.

We owe these suffragists a debt of gratitude for their efforts in their fight to give women the right to vote and to be full participating members in our Nation's political process. I hope that

recognizing the anniversary of the inaugural women's rights convention in 1848 will keep alive the memory of the struggle to win the fundamental right, the right to vote, for women. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine a time when our Nation's women did not have the privilege to vote. Thankfully, we have moved past those times to where we currently have the highest number of female Members in the history of the Congress. Although I think it is very difficult for people to realize, in the history of this Congress, we have had only 249 women, and 90 of them are serving now.

As we all know, the struggle for women to achieve this came at great sacrifice. The fight lasted over many decades because of dedicated perseverance of many women. These pioneers were revolutionary in their fight for equality. They worked tirelessly knowing there would be a future when women were seen as equal to men with the ability to vote.

The historical Seneca Falls Convention, held in 1848, was led by a group of innovative women, including Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Following the convention, they formed the National Woman's Suffrage Association and the American Woman's Suffrage Association which merged together in 1890. Through public speeches, marches, parades, pickets, arrests and even hunger strikes, the members of the associations fought their battle across the country. Their historic efforts came to fruition on August 18, 1920, when the Congress ratified the 19th amendment of the Constitution thereby granting women the right to vote. The goal of the suffragist movement endured over 50 years.

Schools around the world teach their students the rich history of the movement, and it is with pleasure that we promote continued awareness through a National Suffragists Day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Nevada for introducing this legislation. It is amazing and we would never believe that women only have had the right to vote since 1920. It obviously means we have come a long way as a result of women's suffrage. We now have a woman who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which represents movement and progress.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Con. Res. 105, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Suffragists Day. This resolution promotes awareness of the women's suffragist movement and the brave individuals who fought to make the right to vote a reality for all women.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative BERKLEY, for sponsoring this important legislation.

The women's suffragist movement has a long history in America. Today it may seem

hard to believe, but less than one hundred years ago, women did not have the right to vote in federal elections in this country.

National Suffragists Day would honor women such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who together founded the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1869.

These two leaders, along with other courageous women such as Lucretia Mott, Alice Paul, Paulina Kellogg Wright Davis, and countless other brave Americans, fought tirelessly to achieve their God-given rights to freedom and opportunity.

I have introduced legislation of my own to posthumously honor Alice Paul and raise awareness of her powerful contributions to the suffragist movement and American society.

Finally, due to the sacrifice, hard work, and diligence of women like Alice Paul, the 19th Amendment to the Constitution was ratified in the summer of 1920, giving women the right to vote on a national level.

While today's resolution honors some great Americans of the past, it also provides us with an opportunity to look at the current state of women in our country.

We have come a long way as a nation since the summer of 1920. My home state of California is represented by two female Senators. We have a woman serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a very strong female presidential candidate.

Still, there is much more that needs to be done. Inequalities in pay, health care discrepancies, and a lack of good and affordable childcare still haunt many women in the United States today.

We must remain vigilant. We must ensure that all Americans have an equal opportunity for success and happiness. With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for honoring and increasing awareness of suffragists in America, and support H. Con. Res. 105.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 105, supporting goals and ideals of a National Suffragist Day to promote awareness of the importance of the women suffragists who worked for the right of women to vote in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as a woman who has not only enjoyed the privileges and responsibilities of voting, but also of serving my country in elected office, I am extremely proud to co-sponsor this resolution honoring those women who fought for my right, and the right of all women, to participate in the process of governing.

This bill recognizes the tireless work and innovative ideas of women in particular. Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Sojourner Truth, Carrie Chapman Catt, Maud Wood Park, Lucy Burns, and Alice Paul were visionaries in their own times, and remain inspirations to us today. These seven women each challenged a system of male dominance, and asserted the role of women in politics and governance. Many of their methods of civil disobedience and peaceful protesting were taken up by the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 60s, which expanded voting rights to even more of the population.

July 19th will be the anniversary of the first women's rights convention, held in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. To celebrate their accomplishments and raise awareness of the importance of the suffragists who fought for and won the right of women to vote in the United States, this bill designates July 19th as National Suffragists Day.

Mr. Speaker, any of these women would be amazed and proud to see an America where women are not only able to vote, but they are able to run for office. It is incredibly appropriate that this body, presided over by a woman for the first time in its history, should honor their work through a day set aside to raise awareness of their struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to support this resolution because it gives much deserved recognition to one of my heroes, Sojourner Truth, the great abolitionist and suffragist.

In 1843, deciding her mission was to preach the word of God, Sojourner Truth—the name she gave herself as a traveling preacher who speaks the truth—left New York and traveled throughout New England, calling her own prayers meetings and attending those of others. She preached “God’s truth and plan for salvation.”

After months of travel, she arrived in Northampton, Massachusetts, and joined the Northampton Association for Education and Industry, where she met and worked with abolitionists such as William Lloyd Garrison, Frederick Douglass, and Olive Gilbert.

As we know, during the 1850s, slavery became an especially issue in the United States. In 1850, Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Law, which allowed runaway slaves to be arrested and jailed without a jury trial, and in 1857, the Supreme Court ruled in the Dred Scott case that those enslaved had no rights as citizens and that the government could not outlaw slavery in the new territories.

While traveling and speaking in states across the country, Sojourner Truth met many women abolitionists and noticed that although women could be part of the leadership in the abolitionist movement, they could neither vote nor hold public office. It was this realization that led Sojourner to become an outspoken supporter of women’s rights.

In 1851, she addressed the Women’s Rights Convention in Akron, Ohio, delivering her famous speech “Ain’t I a Woman?” The applause she received that day has been described as “deafening.” From that time on, she became known as a leading advocate for the rights of women. Indeed, she was one of the nineteenth century’s most eloquent voices for the cause of anti-slavery and women’s rights.

It was to give proper recognition to her contributions to the struggle to abolish slavery and secure equal rights for women that I introduced H.R. 4510 which would direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the donation of a bust depicting Sojourner Truth and to display the bust in a suitable location in the Capitol. In February of this year, that legislation became law.

I strongly support H. Con. Res. 105, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 105.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2080) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2080

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONFORMING DISTRICT CHARTER TO COUNCIL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PUBLIC EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Home Rule Act is amended—

(1) by striking section 452 (sec. 1—204.52, D.C. Official Code); and

(2) by striking section 495 (sec. 1—204.95, D.C. Official Code).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 452 and the item relating to section 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I offer my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, particularly for the very expeditious way in which he has moved my request for early consideration of the matter before us now.

I rise to request passage of H.R. 2080, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act in keeping with District public school charter revisions proposed by Mayor Adrian Fenty and passed by the Council of the District of Columbia.

I very much appreciate that Chairman HENRY WAXMAN and Chairman DANNY DAVIS considered this bill expeditiously, and the leadership has kindly granted our request for early consideration of the bill on the House floor on the suspension calendar in light of the fact that the matter before the House is not controversial.

The bill supports the District in moving on its own to correct problems in its local school system.

In fact, H.R. 2080 is before the Congress only because the current Home Rule Act now in the process of being revised requires that certain changes

to the District’s charter be made by Federal legislation. I stress that the underlying school reorganization involves no Federal funds and is entirely a local school issue.

However, H.R. 2080 is of major importance to the District of Columbia. And if it were possible, the city would have made these revisions effective immediately. Therefore, I am grateful to the Federal Workforce chair, Mr. DANNY DAVIS, and Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman HENRY WAXMAN for moving this bill as soon as possible in committee, and the subsequent movement to the House floor the very next week, the week in which we now find ourselves.

The school structure change in particular puts a heavy and unprecedented burden on the administration of a new mayor, Mayor Adrian Fenty. Many in the Congress have over the years urged changes in the D.C. public schools; and therefore, I know that the last thing Congress wants to do is get in the way or slow a difficult local school reform process.

The extra congressional level of procedure for a local school restructuring is not within the expertise of a national legislative body whose agenda is packed with urgent national concerns.

□ 1715

The necessity for a Member of Congress to introduce a bill for a self-governing city is an anachronism neither the Congress nor the District deserves or can afford today. I promise the Congress I will try to make this the last time the House or the Senate is requested to pass a charter bill of no concern and of little interest to the Congress of the United States.

I strongly ask that all Members support the swift passage of this bill today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2080 which will implement the District of Columbia Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007. The legislation was passed by a 9-2 vote by the city council on April 19 and was signed by Mayor Fenty on April 23. Because the local bill includes amendments to the Home Rule Act, Congress must pass this bill for it to be effective. I make a special note that this legislation relies solely on local funds.

Before approving the bill, the city council held over 70 hours of hearings. I commend Mayor Fenty for proposing this bold change in governance and the city council for its careful deliberation and amendments to the original proposal.

Key elements of the local bill include streamlined educational responsibility, spending controls and consolidation of functions. The legislation is also intended to resolve issues that have festered between the D.C. public school system and charter schools.

Every city and county is entitled to govern its own school system as it sees

fit, and the District of Columbia ought not to be an exception.

The challenges that have faced the city's public schools are well-known and extensively documented. Congress needs to pass this legislation promptly to ensure these reforms can be in place before school begins again next August. Changes in educational procurement are particularly important. Recent reports of failing boilers and high levels of lead in school water fountains lend a sense of urgency to this bill.

I wish the mayor and the city council well as they assume enhanced responsibility for public education. They have asked through this legislation to be held to a much higher level of accountability, and I commend them for stepping up to the plate on this core function of local government.

This does not obviate the continuing need to provide an alternative to underperforming neighborhood schools. That is why the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program is so vital. Today, the program gives approximately 1,800 low-income students access to schools of their choice. Reauthorization of this excellent program, which will be required by 2008, is necessary as part of our vision to expand and improve opportunities for D.C. students.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2080 repeals sections 452 and 495 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act and permits the District of Columbia Council to establish the District of Columbia public schools as a Cabinet-level agency.

Under H.R. 2080, the mayor and the council will be held accountable for the management of the District's public schools. Section 452 describes the role and responsibilities of the mayor and council with respect to the annual budget process for the District of Columbia public school system. Section 452 provides the mayor and the council authority to establish the maximum amount of funds which will be allocated to the District of Columbia's Board of Education, but they are not allowed to change how the funds are used for educational programs.

H.R. 2080 will eliminate section 452 and allow the mayor and council to determine the level of funding allocations that each program receives. The money for this budget is entirely local money.

Section 495 established the D.C. Board of Education. H.R. 2080 would repeal the powers of the board and gives the mayor and council authority over the District's public schools. Mayor Fenty has been seeking the authority to reform the D.C. public school system since earlier this year.

On January 5, 2007, the mayor submitted the District of Columbia Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, the act, to the D.C. council for

their consideration. The act transfers management and oversight authority for D.C.'s public schools to the mayor.

It transfers all State education agency responsibilities from the Board of Education to the State education office; creates an Interagency Collaboration and Services Integration Commission; establishes an Office of Ombudsman for public education; and a Public Education Facilities Management and Construction Authority.

The D.C. council has held over 70 hours of hearings and heard the testimonies of residents, teachers, students, parents and leading educational experts on the mayor's proposal. The mayor believes that giving him control of D.C. public schools will lead to a dramatic improvement in the District's school system.

The District of Columbia Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007 passed the District of Columbia council on April 19, 2007, by a vote of 9-2. H.R. 2080 will allow the mayor to implement his initiatives to reform D.C. public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and ranking minority member, Representative TOM DAVIS, for introducing this legislation. It is important to note that if D.C. had home rule, this legislation would not be necessary.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation because, in effect, what we are really doing is giving certification, in a sense, to actions that have been taken by the District of Columbia's city council and giving them the authority to exercise responsibility for their own public school system, which is obviously the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2080.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is the 112th day since a great injustice took place in this country.

On January 17, 2007, two United States Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison to begin serving 11- and 12-year sentences respectively.

Agent Compean and Agent Ramos were convicted last spring for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our borders into Texas. These agents never should have been prosecuted. Yet, the U.S. Attorney's office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler. The illegal drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico, and has sued the border patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. And he is not an American citizen.

The American people have not forgotten Agents Ramos and Compean, who should have been commended instead of indicted. I encourage citizens across this country to continue calling the White House and ask the President to use his authority to immediately pardon these two heroes.

Members of Congress and the American people are outraged and concerned with this administration's indifference to the plight of two honorable men who have been crucified unfairly by a Federal prosecutor. These two agents have given years of their lives in service to this Nation; yet they have been unjustly punished for doing their job to protect the American people.

By using the power of his office to pardon these two agents, the President has the opportunity to reverse a grave injustice.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to share part of the comments made by Chairman JOHN CONYERS on the floor last week following my remarks on these two border agents, and I quote the chairman: "It's important that the kinds of concerns you have raised are known to all of our men and women who carry badges and weapons defending us, not just at borders, but in every State in the Union." Again, that is a quote from Chairman JOHN CONYERS.

I want to thank Chairman CONYERS for his interest in this issue, and I am encouraged that the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Committee will soon move forward with hearings to investigate the injustice committed against these two border agents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. LUCY HALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I guess if I had not had to be here today, I would have been back in my community, where I live, at the Friendship Baptist Church, and I would have been there because today was the funeral for Mrs. Lucy Hall, who was the wife of the pastor of that church for the last 50 years.

The Hall family have made tremendous impact on not only the community where we live, but also on the city of Chicago and its surrounding communities.

Mrs. Hall was a retired educator. She and her husband raised their three children in our neighborhood. Two of their children are judges. One is an appellate court judge in the State of Illinois. The other is a supreme court judge in New York, and of course, their son is a noted psychologist who works in the State of New York.

But Mrs. Hall exemplified the essence of excellence. She was indeed a grand lady, full of dignity, full of charm, full of commitment, full of dedication and full of hard work. She and her husband are legends in our neighborhood.

They developed programs which originated at the Friendship Baptist Church to deal with health issues such as cancer. They provided mammogram screening and education. They had after-school reading and boy scouts and tutoring.

So I simply take to the floor this evening to extend my condolences to the Hall family, to Reverend Shelvin Jerome Hall, to Judge Shelvin Louise Hall, to Judge Hall of the Supreme Court in New York, to their brother and the Halls' son and all of the members of a great family in the community where I live and work.

We shall miss her, but we rejoice in the life that she lived.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WALSH of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the tax increase that's coming. Now, we know that in the budget that the Democratic majority put together in the House, they posited the largest tax increase in American history. But that's not the tax increase that I have been referring to. The tax increase I am talking about is something that had its genesis in the 1960s, was renewed in the 1980s, was never insulated against inflation and has been allowed to run riot across the American Tax Code.

The tax increase I am talking about is the alternative minimum tax. In the late 1960s, the alternative minimum tax was created to deal with, at most, several hundred dread taxpayers. They were the people at the very pinnacle of

the American economy who somehow were able to position themselves using a hyper-complicated Tax Code, using it to free themselves almost completely or, in some cases, completely, of tax liability.

In the late 1960s, correctly, Congress, looking at the complexity of the Tax Code and looking at this outcome, thought that isn't fair. So they created an alternative calculation that would provide that everyone pay at least a certain tax liability. That policy was renewed and actually expanded in the late 1980s when Democrats controlled the House of Representatives.

In the process, this alternative minimum tax was applied to what was then very high-income thresholds. Lo and behold, it was never indexed to inflation. Accordingly, more and more people have fallen under this alternative unfavorable tax calculation, which I am going to talk about in this hour, and more and more people that we would consider to be middle class have found themselves under the alternative minimum tax.

More and more small business owners have seen the incentives that they expected to get for making investments in the economy stripped away. More and more families have seen pro-family tax policies taken away from them by the alternative minimum tax.

Far from applying to a few hundred taxpayers, today the alternative minimum tax is applied to nearly 3 million taxpayers. But in past Congresses, quietly, we have moved to at least protect the people who would have been hit in recent years with additional tax liabilities from being covered. We have put in place a series of patches, patches that would protect taxpayers that we wanted to give tax relief from being hit with the AMT.

Those patches have become more expensive. To apply the annual patch next year, we would have to, in effect, set aside \$47 billion to do it. But if we don't do it, not a few hundred taxpayers, not 3 million taxpayers, but 23 million taxpayers in America, including a significant part of the middle class, would have to pay the AMT.

That, frankly, is flat-out unfair and unsustainable. It's a tax increase that Congress had never intended and that the last few Congresses have acted to protect the middle class against.

Yet what has happened here, we find that the majority, the House Democrats, particularly, and their budget, haven't set aside a dime for a patch to deal with the AMT. They want to spend the money, even as they want to spend the money from the lapsing of some of the tax policies that we put in place at the beginning of the decade. They don't call it a tax increase, but they take the money and run.

By not fixing, by not patching the AMT, implicit in their budget is a major tax increase on top of that, on a major part of the middle class. Yet it's far worse than that, because we have been hearing recently in the committee that I serve on, the Ways and

Means committee, that some in the majority want to make changes in the AMT, supposedly to reform it. But they do it by raising taxes elsewhere, and that's what I am here tonight to argue against.

If we deal with the AMT, not by controlling spending and by putting in place a long-term fix, but by simply raising taxes, we run the risk of having a dramatic impact on the economy. I have some numbers here that I think put this into a fairly dramatic perspective. As we have looked at the bracket creep, we have seen many middle class families, particularly in communities with higher taxes and higher standards of living, paying, potentially, the AMT.

What we have looked at is that some of the proposals that have been laid out there would provide AMT tax relief to middle class taxpayers by increasing the tax burden. Specifically, we understand that some in our committee are considering an AMT exemption for families earning up to \$250,000.

That sounds great, but it also, potentially, will raise taxes at the high end. We have just had an election in France. In France, one of the issues was that their economy hasn't been very dynamic because of their top tax rate. The top tax rate in France is about 48 percent. Unfortunately, fixing the AMT would require so much revenue that if it's only done through raising the top rate, our top tax rate would be in the range of 48 percent. That would be a significant break on the economy.

Let me put this into a local perspective. I represent a district where not many people are in the highest income levels, but we have many local businesses and many local manufacturers that are subchapter S companies. They are closely held relationships, and they exist, basically, and pay personal income tax rates. This would, in effect, on some of our most dynamic job-creating local companies put the brake on their growth.

This is a direct tax on jobs in the emerging economy. As such, it is a real concern in a place like northwestern Pennsylvania where we have mainly people who are working class and middle class and very few high-income people. We think that this would have a big impact directly on our local economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very concerned that we get this right, and I am also very concerned, not only that we fix the AMT but also that we do it in the right way. Now, we have a proposal, and I think it's very important to realize there is a proposal out there to repeal the individual AMT.

I am a cochairman of the zero AMT caucus, and I am prime sponsor of a bill, H.R. 1366, that would flat out repeal the AMT. In my view, the AMT is a Frankenstein's monster, which over the years has affected more and more taxpayers by subjecting them to a parallel tax system that arbitrarily and sometimes unpredictably deprives them of tax preferences and incentives that they have planned for.

In effect, the AMT runs the risk of punishing millions of middle class Americans every year with a tax that is, as I have said, was intended only for a handful of the highest level earners. My legislation once and for all would rid the Tax Code of this arcane and unfair tax policy and remove a significant barrier for economic growth in the American economy.

The AMT is not only a source of higher taxes; it's a source of complexity in the Tax Code. Getting rid of it is a priority for many of those who have advocated a simpler Tax Code.

The AMT, I believe, is unfair on the face of it, because it is now applied to a whole host of taxpayers that Congress had originally told them, this will never apply to you. While the structural features of the regular income tax are indexed to inflation, the AMT is not. As a result, as incomes have risen over the past 20 years, more and more taxpayers have fallen into the AMT. I think that Congress needs to act now. Act now to repeal the AMT or at very least to patch it.

As I said earlier, it would take \$47 billion, which is a lot of money, but in a \$3 trillion budget, it's something that we could find the room to do. Patching for 2 years would cost, they estimate, \$110 billion. That's also something that's expensive, but it's something that we should be prepared to do.

An alternative approach would be to make the AMT a temporary tax provision. I have argued potentially for doing that if Congress does not have the will to pursue flat out repeal. But the idea of getting rid of the AMT by simply raising taxes is very, very dangerous.

I was always struck by a quote from H.L. Mencken, "When a new source of taxation is found, it never means, in practice, that an old source is abandoned. It merely means that the politicians have two ways of milking the taxpayer where they previously only had one before."

I think that the unfortunate thing about the AMT is that it is generating now so much revenue that people in Washington are afraid to do away with it. I think we need to have an aggressive approach to getting rid of the AMT that does not simply shift the tax burden more to taxpayers.

We need to come up with a creative way of dealing with this problem. I believe that there is the will to do it. I have offered to work across party lines with my colleagues on the other side, and I want to extend that offer again today.

I do think that if we approach this as something that has to be fixed through a combination of savings and maybe other changes in tax policy, there is going to be a range of ways that we could deal with this problem and certainly to protect the middle class from the AMT falling on it.

□ 1745

But we are concerned when we hear the press reports that suggest that the

House Democrats simply want to use this to raise taxes.

Here is what in effect they are doing. They are taking that additional 20 million taxpayers and they are effectively holding them hostage for a higher tax level which is going to generate revenue for them to fulfill their campaign promises. We think that there has got to be a better way of doing that.

We are also concerned that the AMT can become a locomotive, recognizing that many taxpayers will otherwise be hit by liabilities that AMT relief will become a basis for running through a bill that generates much higher levels of revenue, in effect, manufactures a crisis. That way, the AMT bill becomes a locomotive for driving much higher taxes in the economy.

Today, I would argue very simply, Mr. Speaker, that Washington take a very high percentage of what people earn in America today. The problem and the source of our national deficit is not the fact that we don't generate enough revenue. In fact, revenue has been growing steadily on a year-to-year basis. The problem is not that we haven't entertained tax increases, because in effect we have been passing and adopting tax policies; curiously, through lower capital gains rates we have been generating more revenue from capital gains. The problem has not been a lack of revenue. It has been a lack of spending restraint. And, unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle have approached the AMT problem exclusively as one that needs to be dealt with through revenue.

I think people need to understand what level of taxpayer we are talking about here. The AMT would be applied to people who are authentically middle class. I am struck here by the fact that if we look today, Washington is left to deal with this growing monster that is the AMT that is going to ensnare 23 million Americans come April 15, 2008. It operates as a parallel tax system, and in effect it takes away from taxpayers some preferences that Congress had firmly intended to them. This, I think, represents something that is fundamentally unfair.

We are talking here that, for the year 2006, under the AMT, the basic exemption from the AMT is only \$62,550 for joint returns. This is not, in my view, a wealthy couple. It is \$42,500 for a single and head-of-household returns, which in turn is subtracted to obtain AMT taxable income. It is the income above that that pushes people into the AMT.

These exemption levels, as I have pointed out, are the result of a patch that past Congresses have enacted. In other words, they are temporary and are scheduled to revert in 2007 to their prior levels of \$45,000 for joint returns and \$35,750 for unmarried taxpayers.

The basic AMT exemption is phased out for taxpayers with high levels of AMT income. A two-tiered rate structure of 26 percent and 28 percent is assessed against AMT taxable income.

The taxpayer then, and this is how it works, compares his AMT tax liability to his regular tax liability and pays the greater of the two. As a result, middle-class Americans, hardworking families, are falling victim to what was, and always was, intended to be a policy that was aimed at the wealthiest and which ultimately at the end of the day is simply bad tax policy.

We think that we need to do a better job of dealing with the AMT, but to do that, simply raising taxes, is the wrong way to go.

How high would taxes have to go to deal with the AMT problem? I am struck by an estimate by the Urban Institute in Brookings Tax Policy Center that took a look at this question and came back with some startling figures. They argue that, in order to repeal the AMT, the majority, if they were to do that simply through tax increases, would have to increase the top three brackets very substantially. This study estimates that the majority would have to increase the 28 percent, 33 percent, and 35 percent brackets to 32.2 percent, 38 percent, and 40.3 percent respectively.

On top of the already enormous tax increase in the Democrats' budget, this level is confiscatory tax policy and it is a recipe, in our view, for a quick and nasty economic slowdown.

Well, I sincerely believe that there is the potential for a bipartisan consensus here. I think what we are seeing is a setup for much higher taxes; and that is why I am here on the floor tonight, to blow the whistle on it.

In my own district, in Pennsylvania's Third Congressional District, in 2005, a little over 2,700 taxpayers were impacted by the AMT. By contrast, if Congress does not act, in 2007, roughly 18,500 taxpayers will be hit with the AMT. This is a serious tax bite, and it has to be dealt with in a serious way and not simply by raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the AMT is a classical example of the rule of unintended consequences. The fundamental reason for the spread of the AMT is that the exemption amount was never indexed to inflation. As a result, the AMT spread rapidly before the 2001 and 2003 tax laws were adopted, and it would have continued spreading without those laws. It is projected to spread further after 2010, even if those laws are sunset. Taxpayers who move on the AMT in 2007 through 2010, due to the 2001 and 2003 tax laws, will still enjoy a net tax cut from those laws.

The most recent attempts to deal with the AMT have been through the use of patches; yet, I would argue that a more comprehensive solution is more desirable.

You know, it is also important to realize, we had an opportunity to repeal the AMT in 1999. It passed the House and it passed the Senate. It was part of a broader tax bill, and it was recognized at that time to be a very important priority. Repealing it at that time was something that we knew we could

afford to do; yet, in 1999, the Clinton administration vetoed that legislation. Unfortunately, some of those who now want to deal with the AMT by raising taxes voted to sustain that veto, voted in effect to leave in place a tax that was never intended for the middle class.

The individual AMT doesn't just affect individuals. It also hurts small businesses. The many small businesses that pay the individual AMT lose the benefit of important tax incentives, such as the R&D tax credit, the work opportunity tax credit, accelerated depreciation, and many other general business tax credits. It is, anyone who has been in it and any accountant will tell you, ridiculously complicated and arbitrary. It is almost impossible for the average taxpayer and small business owner to calculate the AMT without help from a tax preparer or from tax software.

If we are serious about dealing with the problem of complexity in the Tax Code, one of the quickest things that we could do, one of the simplest things that we could do is flat-out repeal the AMT. We think this is something that ought to be of direct interest to us today, and we are very concerned that this real problem is being commandeered by those who simply want to raise taxes.

Our solution is that we want to see action today. We want to see both parties come together and talk about this problem honestly, not just discuss plans to raise taxes behind closed doors. We want to see an opportunity here today to discuss how we can use fiscal discipline and restrained spending to get rid of the AMT, or to potentially sunset it and phase it out over time. It is not too late to do that.

We believe that there are ways to deal with the AMT as an alternative that don't require us to bring our top tax rates up to the level of France. I believe that there are means of dealing with this problem without sucker punching our economy. I believe that we have the opportunity to deal with this problem fairly and honestly without presuming a tax increase.

We tend to forget this in Washington, but when somebody is paying out more in taxes, that is a tax increase. Whether that tax increase was the phaseout of a tax provision that was put into the law years ago and simply not renewed, whether that change in tax policy is something that was a policy from the 1960s that was never adjusted or modernized, the fact is we anticipate a tax increase unless we show fiscal restraint this year. And the Democratic budget, in addition to positing the largest tax increase in American history, has manufactured this AMT crisis and created a challenge for us that the Democrats are apparently proposing to respond to simply by raising taxes.

When people hear that the only folks experiencing the tax increase are going to be the highest income people, that doesn't tell the whole story, because so

many jobs are tied up in companies that are also taxed at those rates. This is a challenge that I think requires an authentic bipartisan solution, not just a tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas such time as he may consume.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time, and I thank the Speaker this evening for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, 20 minutes can go by in a flash; 2 minutes seems like an eternity. Last Friday night, Greensburg, Kansas, was struck by a devastating tornado. With 20 minutes' warning, I am sure the people of Greensburg did everything possible to protect their homes, their lives, to gather their loved ones, to find the basement, to seek the shelter. Twenty minutes is an awfully short period of time to try to save your life.

Two minutes, the time that it takes for the tornado 1½ miles wide, winds blowing 207 miles an hour, 2 minutes it takes to destroy a community.

The losses last Friday night in Greensburg, Kansas, are significant. The photograph I have with me demonstrates the look of a town, a county seat town of Kiowa County, Kansas, population about 1,500. In many ways, a typical Kansas community; in many ways, a typical small town in rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Greensburg, Kansas, for the last 3 days. And perhaps what I see is typical, but what I see is heroics. From the moment the tornado struck, the people of Greensburg arose to the occasion, and every moment since then, their lives have been devoted toward making certain that people are okay, seeking recovery of their loved ones and their property, and trying to make certain that everyone is found and that life is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, 2 minutes did a lot of damage to a community; and yet in every conversation I had with the citizens of Greensburg, ultimately at least a small smile would come upon their face because they were able to count the blessings that they had despite the tornado. They were able to talk about the next opportunity they have to rebuild their lives, the people's whose lives were saved, the people whose lives are here today.

Mr. Speaker, this community has lost its entire housing structure. I walked through Greensburg for about 45 minutes on Saturday, a town that I represented as a State senator and now as a Member of Congress, and I found one home in that 45 minutes that I thought would be habitable.

□ 1800

The downtown business district is gone. You know, especially, Mr. Speaker, how difficult it is to preserve and enhance a business district in rural communities.

This is a community that has a business district maybe of six or seven

blocks, both sides of the street. But every business destroyed. Gone is the city hall. Gone is the high school. Gone is the grade school. Gone is the hospital. Gone is the library.

This community faces many challenges, Mr. Speaker. But in each and every instance, not only have the citizens of that community arose to the occasion, not only have the citizens of that community done everything they could to save lives and protect property; but now already they talk of, how do we rebuild our hometown?

I spent a little time with the national media who are covering this story in Greensburg, Kansas, and my guess is Greensburg, Kansas, is probably a foreign country to many of them. And their question is, as they look across the rubble that's demonstrated in this photograph is, Congressman, can you really believe that this community has a future; that they will be around 2 years from now, 5 years from now, a decade from now? And the answer is yes.

I don't know a lot about lots of other communities in the country. But I know about the people of Greensburg, Kansas, and they will make every effort to see that their community survives and prospers, and that their children and grandchildren have a future there. You know, there's a special place we all call, it's called home. And everybody wants to live where it's home. And so, as the folks of Greensburg try to pick up their lives, rebuild their homes, re-establish the businesses, recreate a community, they just want Greensburg to be home again.

And so tonight I rise to commend them for their spirit, acknowledge their bravery, speak about their compassion and love for their friends and family and neighbors. And I especially want to talk about the city officials, the mayor, Lonnie McCollum, the city manager, Steve Hewett.

Perhaps people don't realize that the people who are there today trying to restore the electricity, the water, the sewer, the telephone service, the power, they, too, lost everything. So as the city officials have gone back to work trying to restore the basic needs of a community, they face the challenges of not having a home, vehicles destroyed, families living outside the community.

And Mr. Speaker, in addition to the city officials and the people of Greensburg, the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, Heart to Heart, church groups, hundreds and thousands of people across the country on Sunday said their prayers for the people of Greensburg, Kansas. Offering plates were passed. The community of Haviland, a small town much smaller than the community of Greensburg, 15 miles down the road, the grocery store open on Sunday. I was there. I watched as the owner of the grocery store, no small task to keep a grocery store in Haviland, Kansas, alive and well, but I

watched as customers placed groceries on the counter. And the grocery store owner said, where are you from? And the answer was, Greensburg. No charge.

That's the community that people call home in Kansas and many places across the country. And it's that effort that we are seeing today in which people come to the aid and rescue of their friends and neighbors and people they don't even know to make certain that good happens in a very difficult and challenging time.

And we are pleased with the National Guard. We are pleased with the services we have with surrounding communities and their law enforcement, emergency preparedness. And FEMA has arrived on the spot almost from day one, almost from the first moment the tornado struck.

I just got off the phone with the National Weather Service in Dodge City, Kansas. 20 minutes is not very long. But that 20 minutes, because of the efforts of the folks forecasting the weather that night, saved lives.

And I would ask that Kansans and Americans tonight again say their prayers for the people of Greensburg, that they recognize that we in America, no matter where the challenge or difficulty lies, we are in it together. And I would ask that, throughout the course of time, that the contributions be collected, the efforts be made to restore the community and that all Americans share in that process.

The people of Greensburg ought to be reassured that we, in Congress, we, as the Federal Government, will do everything within our power to assist them in their efforts. We want to reassure them that the future is theirs, and we're here to help.

And the role that we play as a Federal Government, the role that all the agencies who have arrived to provide assistance is important. But the reality is that Greensburg, Kansas, has a future because the people who call Greensburg home want to ensure that future comes tomorrow, next year and for another generation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to pay tribute to a community back home.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I'd yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for his stirring words. I can say in northwestern Pennsylvania, we have watched the developments in Kansas with horror, because it was just a couple of decades ago that we had a series of major tornado events that very much marked, seemingly immutably, many of our rural communities. And I think of Albion, Pennsylvania, and how it took years for its downtown to bounce back.

Can I reassure the gentleman that I think all of his colleagues appreciate his plea, appreciate the terrible dilemma facing so many of his constitu-

ents? And you can count on our solidarity in this effort.

And it seems a little trite to point this out, but I have to say, the gentleman has always been one of the most eloquent voices for rural America. He has done a great job here tonight of laying before us the plight of this community. But we are particularly grateful for his advocacy tonight, and I want to say, our prayers will be with you. Our resources will be with you, and Northwestern Pennsylvania will be there for Kansas in any way we can help out.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the words of encouragement, the phone calls, the letters and the conversations I have had with my colleagues from across the country who, like you, express their care and concern for the people of Kansas.

Mr. POMEROY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I'd be happy to yield to you.

Mr. POMEROY. I just also very briefly, representing the other side of the aisle, want to echo the statements so eloquently made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

JERRY, you spoke right from the heart. We can feel the pain that you're feeling on behalf of those who have had their lives just devastated. It's important for them to know that they're going to have your first class advocacy. And you certainly just put that on display tonight.

And it's also important for them to know that we offer them our prayers. And beyond that, we will be with them as they rebuild.

I represented a city that got flooded, and it took years, but we just had the 10-year commemoration of that event, and this city is back, bigger and better than ever.

Now, I've never seen anything like the picture that you put on display tonight. It's a different challenge. A different magnitude of effort's going to be required, but we will be with you. The Federal Government will be there, and we will follow your lead as we fashion a response that meets the need, the tremendous need in the wake of this tornado. I yield back.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank so much the gentleman from North Dakota who, I know, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, understands that rural America is a special place, and the place called home, in this case a place called Greensburg, Kansas, matters a lot, not only in the future of that community, but in the future of a way that we try to preserve here, a way of life that matters, I think, to all of America.

Again, I express my appreciation to my colleagues for their support. I remind the folks of Greensburg, Kansas, that we'll be an ally. I thank those who have worked so hard to this point to see that there is an opportunity for a future.

And tonight I especially say my prayers for the family members of those whose families lost their lives. Ten people died in the tornado on Friday night.

Life is a very precious thing, and we offer our prayers. We seek the support of all as we try to rebuild Greensburg, Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to keep my remaining remarks brief and, again, salute the gentleman for taking the time to come down and share the experience of his district and his community with this awful weather disaster, which we in northwestern Pennsylvania certainly understand and certainly we will reach into our pockets and be generous in helping our fellow Americans.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, for a moment, return to my prior topic, put my green eye shade back on and talk about the AMT and its potential effect on taxpayers.

You know, one point that I hadn't had the opportunity to make earlier, was that over the past few weeks, in the ramp up to what we fear will be an attempt to use the AMT as a basis for a broader tax increase, we've heard made the strange argument by our friends on the other side of the aisle that somehow, the AMT is falling on more families because of the tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003. This argument has been echoed within the Ways and Means Committee, and it's bizarre on the face of it. But there are actually arguments that are being made trying to connect these dots and square this circle.

The argument is that, as a result of reduced income tax rates relative to the AMT, more taxpayers are subject to the AMT. Conversely, this logic maintains that if income taxes are increased, less people would be subject to the AMT. It's an odd reform that raises taxes on Americans, and this smells an awful lot like robbing Peter to pay Paul. After all, if taxpayers are paying the AMT, or paying the basic income tax, one way or the other, what is relevant to them is how much they're paying.

The argument we are hearing from the other side simply runs roughshod over the facts. The AMT is growing significantly because the tax brackets involved were never indexed to inflation. Clearly, no American is worse off under recent tax relief. And fewer taxpayers are subject to the AMT than otherwise would be as a result of the patches that that tax relief contained.

I have, I believe, a number of charts, but I am not going to trouble you with them at this time of the evening, that demonstrate that this problem has been stated in an unusual way. It is misleading to claim that the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts led to more people paying the AMT.

The fact is, between the patches and the tax cuts, fewer people are paying

the AMT today than would have under pre-2001 tax laws. This is a very important revelation.

The fact is, past Congresses have moved, in budget after budget, to protect the middle class from the ravages of the AMT. Notwithstanding that, the AMT now hits nearly 3 million taxpayers, where it was originally designed only to hit a few hundred. Without a patch, the AMT would fall on 23 million taxpayers.

Because of that added tax liability on 20 million taxpayers, fixing the AMT is certainly a challenge. But to me, it's a much bigger challenge to argue that somehow we should let the AMT fall on these people when it was never conceived as a tax to be applied to them.

□ 1815

The fact is the AMT at the current rate runs the risk of crowding out the rest of the tax code and becoming the Tax Code, and that would be a disaster. The AMT does not treat families as favorably. It does not treat small business investment as favorably. It doesn't have the nuances of the current Tax Code, and it simply has higher rates.

We believe that in the end, the real solution is fundamental tax reform, to move to a reformed tax system that contains no AMT but through its simplicity also requires no AMT to guarantee that everyone pays what they are obliged to pay. Through simplicity we can reduce the tax gap. We can make the Tax Code more predictable, and we can provide through fewer loopholes fewer opportunities for people to take unfair advantage. That is the real solution at the end.

I believe, though, that we are going to see this year a concerted effort by the new majority to do what they did the last time they were in the majority, and that is to push through massive tax increases. The AMT, it looks like, is going to be their first excuse to do it. So it is going to be the first real test of this Congress, whether it is going to take a different route than that that we traditionally expect or whether it is going to go down the old path of tax and spend, raising taxes, expanding the size of government, and ultimately hitting the taxpayers in newer and more subtle ways.

Enacting French tax structures is not the solution to growing the economy. It is not the solution to the deficit, and it is not the solution to the AMT.

I think the time has come for Congress to deal with this issue honestly, to bring it out into the open. My hope is that our committee, the Ways and Means Committee, will have an opportunity to do hearings specifically on this point. As ranking member of the Select Revenue Measures Subcommittee, I also hope that we have the opportunity there to more closely examine the AMT and to build on recent hearings to look at actual solutions and come up with a solution that

reduces the tax burden and protects the middle class rather than simply raising taxes. That may be a challenge that requires statesmanship, but I believe the time has come to deal with this issue directly.

Anyone who, I believe, signs on to what the papers tell us might be the solution here can't claim that they are following certainly the dictum of Americans for Tax Reform, which years ago got many Members of Congress to sign a pledge not to raise taxes. I believe that any AMT solution that raises taxes will put Congress on record as being in favor of Big Government and higher taxes. I believe that we need to look at creative alternatives and the time has come for that.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to take my party's leadership hour.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1850

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1684, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. CARDOZA, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-136) on the resolution (H. Res. 382) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1684) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1873, SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS IN CONTRACTING ACT

Mr. CARDOZA, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-137) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2013

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut) at 8 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 7 and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 7 and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 1:30 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALSH of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1551. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Department's Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report, Compliance with EPCA and E.O. 13149 in Fiscal Year 2006, pursuant to Public Law 109-58, section 701; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1552. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on the actions Federal Agencies are taking to incorporate and implement the May 2002 Interagency Agreement, pursuant to Public Law 107-58, section 372(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1553. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Report to Congress on Marketing Violent Entertainment to Children: A Fifth Follow-up Review of Industry Practices In the Motion Picture, Music Recording & Electronic Game Industries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-20, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1555. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation from January 1 to December 31, 2006, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3281(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1556. A letter from the Chair, Commission on International Religious Freedom, transmitting the Commission's 2007 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6412 Public Law 105-292 section 102; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1557. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting a memorandum of transmittal for the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea concerning the Korean Seismic Research Stations, Wonju, Republic of Korea, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2565; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1558. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on the Millennium Challenge Corporation's activities for fiscal year 2006, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 613; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1559. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2006 Annual Report on United Nations voting practices, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2414a; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1560. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a request for the prompt consideration and passage of H.R. 6060, the Department of State Authorities Act of 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2007-15 on the Eligibility of the Republic of Montenegro and the Republic of Serbia to Receive Defense Articles and Defense Services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of

defense articles and services to the Governments of Korea, United Kingdom, and the Netherlands (Transmittal No. DDTC 014-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1563. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of major defense articles to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 013-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment in the Government of Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 001-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1565. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering current military, diplomatic, political, and economic measures that are being or have been undertaken to complete out mission in Iraq successfully, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 1227; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1566. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2007 through March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1567. A letter from the Chair, Antitrust Modernization Commission, transmitting the Commission's report and recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 107-273, section 11058; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1568. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs for Fiscal Years 2005, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1569. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report providing an estimate of the dollar amount of claims (together with related fees and expenses of witnesses) that, by reason of the acts or omissions of free clinic health professionals will be paid for 2008, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1570. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, between Sandy Point and Kent Island, MD [CGD05-06-104] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 29, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1571. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Falmouth Maine, Casco Bay [CGD01-06-026] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received April 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1572. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Fireworks Display, Trent River, New Bern, North Carolina [CGD05-06-092] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 3, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1573. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; ChampBoat Grand Prix of Savannah; Savannah, Georgia [CGD07-06-191] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1574. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment, Modification and Revocation of VOR Federal Airways; East Central United States. [Docket No. FAA-2006-24926; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASW-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1575. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change to Time of Designation of Restricted Area 6320; Matagorda, TX [Docket No. FAA-2006-26646; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASW-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1576. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-2; East Central United States. [Docket No. FAA-2006-25673; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASW-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1577. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP Model Gulfstream 100 Airplanes, and Model Astra SPX and 1125 Westwind Astra Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27077; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-286-AD; Amendment 39-14916; AD 2007-03-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1578. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, A-340-300, A340-500, and A340-600 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27064; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-274-AD; Amendment 39-14915; AD 2007-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1579. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26217; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-209-AD; Amendment 39-14886; AD 2007-01-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1580. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 and 900, and Falcon 900EX Airplanes; and Model Falcon 2000 and Falcon 2000EX Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25988; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-14884; AD 2007-01-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1581. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310-300 Airplanes

[Docket No. FAA-2006-25079; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-14885; AD 2007-01-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1582. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8-55, DC-8F-54, and DC-8F-55 Airplanes; and Model DC-8-60, DC-8-70, DC-8-60F, and DC-8-70F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-183-AD; Amendment 39-14889; AD 2007-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1583. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300-600 airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27150; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-288-AD; Amendment 39-14929; AD 2007-03-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1584. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Santa Cruz, CA. [Docket No. FAA-2006-25922; Airspace Docket No. 06-AWP-17] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1585. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change to Controlling Agency of Restricted Area 2312; Fort Huachuca, AZ [Docket No. FAA-2006-26599; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASW-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1586. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Low Altitude Reporting Point; AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25905; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1587. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class D/E Airspace; Big Delta, Allen Army Airfield, Fort Greely, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25947; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-31] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1588. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment, Modification and Revocation of VOR Federal Airways; East Central United States [Docket No. FAA-2006-24926; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASW-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1589. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newton Field, ME [Docket No. FAA-2006-26032; Airspace Docket No. 06-ANE-01] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1590. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bethel Regional Airport,

ME [Docket No. FAA-2006-26031, Airspace Docket No. 06-ANE-02] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1591. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Griffiss Airfield, Rome, NY. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26095; Airspace Docket No. 06-AEA-014] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1592. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ridgway, PA [Docket No. FAA-2006-23907; Airspace Docket No. 06-AEA-03] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1593. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E-2 Airspace; Griffiss Airfield, Rome, NY. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26116; Airspace Docket No. 06-AEA-015] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1594. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E-2 Airspace; Griffiss Airfield, Rome, NY. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26116; Airspace Docket No. 06-AEA-015] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1595. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, East Haddam, CT [CGD01-06-128] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1596. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30534 Amdt. No. 3204] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1597. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30532 Amdt. No. 3202] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1598. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30536 Amdt. No. 3206] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received March 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1599. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, TSA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's report on Security Plan for Essential Air Service and Small Community Service Airports, pursuant to Public Law 109-347, section 701; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Supplemental report on H.R. 1873. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-111, Pt. 3).

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1505. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the "James A. Leach Federal Building"; with amendments (Rept. 110-132). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 79. A resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 110-133). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 123. A resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 110-134). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 352. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week (Rept. 110-135). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 382. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1684) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-136). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 383. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-137). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2199. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain improvements in the treatment of individuals with traumatic brain injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to the use of the leave transfer program by wounded veterans who are Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Committee on Care of Veterans with Traumatic Brain Injury; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for wage insurance for dislocated workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2203. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to increase student access and participation in supplemental educational services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2204. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve recruitment, preparation, distribution, and retention of public elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TERRY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. PORTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage guaranteed lifetime income payments from annuities and similar payments of life insurance proceeds at dates later than death by excluding from income a portion of such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 2206. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 2207. A bill making supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in ad-

dition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HILL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 2208. A bill to provide for a standby loan program for certain coal-to-liquid projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 2209. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to add clementines to the list of fruits and vegetables subject to minimum quality import requirements issued by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 2210. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prevent and cure diabetes and to promote and improve the care of individuals with diabetes for the reduction of health disparities within racial and ethnic minority groups, including the African-American, Hispanic American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2211. A bill to require the President to transmit to Congress a report on every program of the Federal Government that authorizes or requires the gathering of information on United States persons in the United States, established whether in whole or in part pursuant to the "all necessary and appropriate force" clause contained in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2212. A bill to require the President to close the Department of Defense detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to prohibit the use of certain anti-competitive forward contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act to establish integrated English literacy and civics education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. FARR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2215. A bill to provide a reduction in the aggregate greenhouse gas emissions per unit of energy consumed by vehicles and aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to include crimes against the homeless; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2217. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to include homeless status in the definition of "hate crime" for the purposes of Federal sentencing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2218. A bill to provide for a Biofuels Feedstocks Energy Reserve, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and guarantee loans for the production, distribution, development, and storage of biofuels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SIREs, Mr. LOEBsACK, Mr. HILL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 2219. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award a grant to a private, nonprofit entity to establish, publicize, and operate a national toll-free suicide prevention telephone hotline targeted to and staffed by veterans of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CONAWAY, and Ms. FALLIN):

H.R. 2220. A bill to permit educational agencies and institutions to disclose certain information to parents of students who may pose a significant risk to their own safety or well-being, or to the safety or well-being of others; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WU, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr.

TIERNEY, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEHMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2221. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 2223. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to conduct a study on prescription drug take-back programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand the definition of firefighter to include apprentices and trainees, regardless of age or duty limitations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2225. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit a report to Congress providing a master plan for the use of the West Los Angeles Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide readjustment counseling and related mental health services to veterans through the use of mobile centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. BONO):

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 125th anniversary of the city of Billings, Montana; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H. Res. 384. A resolution congratulating the University of Wyoming Cowgirls for winning the Women's National Invitational Tournament for the first time and for their most successful season in school history; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts introduced a bill (H.R. 2227) for the relief of Paul Green; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 39: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 44: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 60: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 78: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 87: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 89: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 176: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 197: Mr. GORDON, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 225: Mr. POE.
H.R. 237: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 278: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HARE, Mr. SPACE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 297: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 303: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 380: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 381: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 406: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 443: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 445: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 457: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 464: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 508: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 522: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 526: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 549: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 551: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. POE.
H.R. 552: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 604: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 621: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 629: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 676: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 698: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 711: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 728: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 734: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 736: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 741: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 743: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 748: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARE, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 760: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 820: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 821: Ms. HARMAN and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 840: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 890: Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 919: Mr. PAUL and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 926: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 989: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 996: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1009: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1010: Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1022: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1023: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1051: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1064: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HARE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. McNERNEY.

H.R. 1069: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1073: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 1074: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1107: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 1115: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 1125: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 1176: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1186: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1188: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1193: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1194: Mr. HARE and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1197: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 1224: Mr. WICKER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1225: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1230: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1232: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 1236: Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 1239: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 1293: Mr. PORTER and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1304: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 1306: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1329: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1394: Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1395: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 1400: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HARE, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Heller.
H.R. 1414: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1426: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1430: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 1457: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1469: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1470: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1474: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1483: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 1522: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1537: Mr. SIREs, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 1539: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 1551: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1553: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1560: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1567: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1576: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1600: Mr. UPTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1608: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1616: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1619: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1653: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1687: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1688: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1700: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1709: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1717: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1727: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 1738: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1740: Mr. GORDON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1742: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1748: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1756: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1759: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1767: Mr. COBLE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1776: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 1783: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1813: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1870: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1877: Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1903: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1908: Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1911: Ms. CARSON and Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1921: Mr. HOLT and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1941: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1945: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. GILCHRIST.
H.R. 1957: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. LEE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1961: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1965: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1971: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1984: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 1992: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2015: Ms. CARSON, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2017: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2022: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2027: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2032: Mr. STARK, Mr. HARE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2035: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2053: Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. CASTOR, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2111: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2137: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2138: Mr. HOLT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 2147: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2183: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2193: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. SHAYS.
H. Con. Res. 48: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. KENNEDY.
H. Con. Res. 105: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. BILBRAY.
H. Con. Res. 131: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Con. Res. 133: Mrs. DRAKE.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. WU.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 142: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 121: Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 135: Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 143: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 189: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 194: Mr. WATT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Res. 231: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 251: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. ROSS.
H. Res. 257: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 258: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. WALBERG.
H. Res. 281: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. McCOTTER.
H. Res. 282: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 291: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 296: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H. Res. 339: Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 345: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BUYER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H. Res. 351: Mr. WAMP, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H. Res. 352: Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 366: Mr. WU and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1684

OFFERED BY: Mr. TERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of title XI add the following:

SEC. ____ . REQUIREMENT TO CONSULT STATES REGARDING GRANT AWARDS.

Before the release by the Department of Homeland Security of any information regarding the award of any grant to a State with amounts authorized under section 101, including before submitting to Congress any list of such grant awards, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with States.